LOKMANYA TILAK'S SPEECH

ON

" HOME RULE "

AT BELGAUM.

[*1st May 1916.*]

[English translation of the Marathi speeches as supplied to the Court by Mr., Thakur, the translator.]

Place Tent of the 18th Bombay Provincial Conference.

Time. 6 to 7-30 P. M.

The lecture was given immediately after the meeting held under the auspices of the Historical Research Society.

In the beginning the Hon. Mr. D. V. Belvi said:— " My friend Lok. Bal Gangadhar Tilak is going to deliver a lecture on Home Rule. I propose that on this occasion, Dadasahib Khaparde, the President of our Provincial Conference, should take the chair." After Mr. Masur had seconded this proposal, Dadasaheb Khaparde rose to speak amidst loud cheers. He said ; " Consider it to be a good fortune of our people, that there should be a subject like *swarajya* and a lecturer like Mr. Tilak. That both these things should come together at our house and that the Home Rule League which was to be started this year should also be established to-day—this union of

three* auspicious events has taken place here. Hence, you will be pleased to hear with a calm mind what Mr. Tilak has to say, ponder over it, and digest it well, so much so that you yourselves may become soldiers sympathising with *swarajya* and contending and caring for it. A man becomes one with the object about which he is thinking. The bee has no progeny. But it captures and brings insects from outside, looks at them and draws their attention towards itself. In the end those insects become bees. I have stood up to say that we too should study this subject in the above manner. Now Lokamanya Tilak will speak on his subject at length. "

Then Mr. Tilak rose to speak amidst loud cheers He said :—

"When I was requested to give a lecture here to-day I did not know on what to lecture. I do not stand before you to-day after having made any preparation for any particular subject. I had come for the conference. Thinking that it would not be improper if I were to say a few words to you about those subjects which were discussed during the past two or three days and about the object with which a Home Rule League was established here before the Congress, I have selected that subject for to-day's lecture.

" What is *swarajya* ? Many have a misconception about this. Some do not understand this thing. Some understanding it, misrepresent it. Some do not want it. Thus there are many kinds of them. Therefore I am not

---

*(Lit, the union of three sacred rivers which is supposed to take place at Allahabad.)

prepared to-day to m particular discussion of any sort beyond saying a few general words on the following among other points : What is *swarajya* ? Why do we ask for it ? Are we fit for it or not ? In what manner must we make this demand for *swarajya* of those of whom we have to make it ? In what direction and on what lines are we to carry on the work which we have to carry on ? It is not the case that these general words which I am going to say are the outcome of my effort and exertion alone. The idea *of swarajya* is an old one. Of course when *swarajya* is spoken of (it shows that) there is some kind of rule opposed to *swa, i. e.* our, and (that) this idea originates at that time. This is plain. When such a condition arrives it begins to be thought that there should be *swarajya*, and men make exertions for that purpose. You are at present in that sort of condition. Those who are ruling over you do not belong to your religion, race or even country. The question whether this rule of the English Government is good or bad is different. The question of about 'one's own' and 'alien' is also different. Do not make a confusion of the two at the outset. When the question 'alien, or one's own ?' comes, we must say 'alien.' When the question 'good or bad' comes, say 'good' or say 'bad.' If (you) say 'bad,' then what improvement must be made in it ?—this question is different. If (you) say 'good' it must be seen waht good things are under it which were not under the former rule. These are different points of view. Formerly there were many kingdoms in our India—in some places there was Mohammadan (rule), in some places there was Rajput (rule) in some places there was Hindu (rule) and in some pla-

ces there was Maratha (rule)—were these *swarajyas* good or bad ? I again remind you that this is a different question. We shall consider it afterwards. All those being broken up, the universal sovereignity of the English Government has been established in India. To-day we have not to consider the history of their down-fall. We have also not to consider how they fell. Nor am I going to speak about it. But the present system of administration is such that some able men who have been educated in England and have received college education come to India and the State administration of India is carried on through them. 'Emperor' is (merely) a name. When you give a visible form to the sentiment which arises in your mind at the mention of (the word) *raja i. e.* (king) there is the present Emperor. This sentiment is invisible. When a visible form is given to this invisible (something,) there is the king—the Emperor. But the Emperor dose not carry on the administration. The question of *swarajya* is not about the Emperor, not about this invisible sentiment. This must be remembered at the outset. Let there be any country, it must have a king, it must have some man to carry on its management and there must be exercised some sort of rule over it. The case of anarchical nations is different. Such nations never rise. As in a house there must be some one to look after its management—when there is no man belonging to the house an outsider is brought in as a trustee—just so is the case also of a kingdom. In every country there is a certain body for carrying on its administration and there is some (sort of) arrangement. An analysis must be made of both these things, viz., of this arrange-

ment and this body and, as stated yesterday by the President (the President of the Provincial Conference*) of the sentiment of 'king.' There must be a king, there must be State administration. Both these propositions are true from the historical point of view. Of a country where there is no order, where there is no king, that is, where there is no supervising body, the *Mahabharat* says 'A wise man should not live even for a moment at that place.' There is no knowing when, at that place our lives may be destroyed, when our wealth may be stolen, when our house may be dacoited, nay, set on fire. There must be a government. I will not say at length what there was in the Kritayug† in ancient times. The people of that time did not require a king. Every one used to carry on dealings only after seeing in what mutual good lay. Our Puranas say that there was once a condition when there was no king. But if we consider whether such a state existed in historical times it will appear that such s condition did not exist in historical times. There must be some controller or other. That control cannot be exercised every time by all people assembling together at one place. Hence, sovereign authority is always divided into two parts: one the advisory body, and the other the executive body. The question about *swarajya* which has now arisen in India is not about the said invisible sentiment. This question is not about those who are to rule over us, (and) according to whose leadership, by whose order and under whose guidance that rule is to be exercised. It is an undisputed fact that

* The brackets are in the original.

† The first of the four ages according to the Hindus.

we should secure our own good under the rule of the English people themselves, under the supervision of the English nation, with the help of the English nation, through their sympathy, through their anxious care and through those high sentiments which they possess. And I have to say nothing about this (cheers). This is the first thing. Do not create confusion in your minds by confounding both the things. These two things are quite distinct. What we have to do we must do with the help of some one or other, since to-day we are in such a helpless condition. It is an undoubted fact that we must secure our good under their protection. Had it not been so, your independence would never have gone. Hence if we take for granted that we have to bring about the dawn of our good fortune with the help of the English Government and the British Empire, then the one more strange thing which some people see (lit. think) in this will altogether disappear. To speak in other words, there is no sedition in this. If then without* the help of the English Government—if the words 'invisible English Government,' be used for the words—'English Government' there would be no mistake—if with the help of this invisible English Government, with the aid of this invisible English Government, you are to bring about the dawn of your good fortune, then, what is it that you ask? This second question arises. The anawer to it, again, lies in the very distinction of which I spoke to you. Though a Government may be invisible, still when it begins to become visible, the management of that kingdom is carried on by its hands and by its actions. This state of

* Sic.

being visible is different from invisible Government. If you ask how, (I say) in the same manner as the great *Brahma* is different from *Maya*. I have taken the word visible and invisible from *Vedanta* (philosophy). The great *Brahma* which is without attributes and form is different and the visible form which it assumes when it begins to come under the temptation of *maya*, is defferent. Hence these dealings which are due to *maya* are sure to change. What is the characteristic of *maya*? (It is) to change every moment. One Government will remain (viz.) invisible Government; and the visible Government changes every moment. The words *Swarajya* which has now arisen relates to visible Government. Maintaining the invisible Government as one, what change, if effected in the momentarily changing visible Government, would be beneficial to our nation? This is the question of *Swarajya*. And this being called* the question of *Swarajya*, there arises the question: 'In whose hands should be that sort of administration which is now carried on in our India? We do not wish to change the invisible Government—English Government. We say that (the administration) should not be in the hands of a visible entity by whose hands this invisible Government is getting works done, but should pass into some other's hands. The *Swarajya* agitation which is now carried on is carried on in the belief that this administration if carried on by some other hands (or) with the help of some one else, (or) by some other visible form would be (more) beneficial to the people than when carried on by those by whose hands it is carried on. If

* Not clear in the original.

another instance is to be given, it can be said that there is an Emperor in England. An English Act contains the rule that king commits no wrong.† The king never commits a wrong (lit. offence). For his authority is limited in such a manner that (only) when a certain minister goes and tells something to him then he knows it. The Prime Minister does act on his own responsibility. There may be a good many (people) here who have studied English history. It is not the case that this is not so. This is the chief principle in it. This principle having arisen in English history, (the number of) sedition cases began to fall. While here, these (people) begin to institute cases of sedition. Those who carry on the administration are different and the king is different. The king is one and the same. But the minister changes every five years. At that time no one says that it would be sedition if any one were to start any discussion advocating change of ministry. These are the things happening every day before the eyes of the English people. The king's circle (of ministers) went (out of office) after five years, went [out of office] after two years; they may quarrel among themselves as they like. What is that to the king? He is the great *Brahma* without attributes. He is not affected by this. The *Swvrajya* agitation now existing in India is then about change in such a ministry. Who rules in India? Does the Emperor come and do it? He is to be taken in procession like a god on a great occasion, we are to manifest our loyalty towards him, this alone is

‡ These words are in English in the original.

their duty.* Through whom, then, is the administration carried on? It is carried on through those who are now servants (viz.) the State Secretary, Viceroy, Governor, below him the Collector, the Patil and lastly the police sepoy. If it be said that one Police sepoy should be transferred and another Police sepoy should be given, would that constitute sedition? If it be said that the Collector who has come is not wanted and that another is wanted, would that constitute sedition? If it be said that one Governor is not wanted, another Governor should be brought, would that constitute sedition? If it be said 'This State Secretary is not wanted, bring another' would that constitute sedition? No body has called this sedition. The same principle which is applicable to a Police sepoy is also applicable to the State Secretary. We are the subjects of the same king whose minister the State Secretary is and whose servant he is. This then being so, if any one were to say, 'The State Secretary is not wanted, this Viceroy is not wanted, Fuller Saheb is not wanted in Bengal, such resolutions have often been passed in the case of Governors, not in the present but in the past times' and were to give reasons for that, you would say about him that his head must have been turned (and that) the reasons he gives are not good or sufficient. But from the historical point of view it does not follow that when he says so, that constitutes sedition (cheers). Our demand belongs to the second class. It is concerned with *swarajya*. Consider well what I say. If you think that the present administration is carried on well, then

*This sentence is not clear in the original.

I have nothing to say. In the congresses and conferences that are now held you come and say: 'Our Kulkarni Vatan has been taken (away), zulum has been exercised upon us in connection with the Forest Department, liquor (drinking) has spread more in connection with the Abkari (Department), also we do not receive that sort of education which we ought to get.' What is the root of all this? What is the benefit of merely saying this? Why do you not get education? Why are shops of the Abkari Department opened where we do not want them? In the Forest Department, laws about reserved forests and about forest of this sort or of that sort are made. Why were they made? At present, lists upon lists about this come before the Congress. Why was your jury abolished against your will? Why was no college opened in the Karnatic up to this time? All these questions are of such a kind that there is but one answer to them. At present our thoughts run this way: is there no College? —make petition to the Collector or to the Governor, because they have power in their hands. If this power had come into your hands if you had been the officials in their places or if their authority had been responsible to the public opinion, these things would not have happened. No other answer than this can be given to the above. These (things) happen because there is no authority in your hands. The authority to decide these matters is not given to you for whose good this whole arrangement is to be made. Hence what we may have to ask becomes like (that asked by) a little child. It cries when it is hungry. It cannot say that it is hungry. Then the mother has to find out whether it may be

hungry or have a bellyache. Sometimes the remedies used prove to be out of place. Such has become our condition at present. In the first place you do not at all know what you want (and) where lies your difficulty. When you came to know it, you began to speak with your mouth. But you have no power in your hands to cause (things) to be done according to your words. Such being the condition, what has happened now? Whatever you have to do, whatever you want—if you want to dig a well in your house—make a petition to the Collector. If you want to kill a tiger in the forest make a petition to to the Collector. Grass is not obtained, bundles (of wood) are not obtained, from the forest, permission to cut grass is required—petition the Collector. That is to say, all this has become like (the case of a) helpless man. We do not want this arrangement. We want some better arrangement than this. That is *Swarajya*, that is Home Rule. In the beginning these questions do not arise, As when a boy is young he knows nothing, when he grows up he begins to know these things, and then begins to think that it would be very good if the household management were made at least to some extent according to his opinion, just so it is with a nation. When (lit. as) it is able to consider this thing, when it acquires the capacity of considering (this thing) then this question is likely to arise. But now the condition here has become such that we had better give up the above thought, let us give up the thought about the invisible Government, let us come within the limits of the visible Government, (we then see that) the people who make this arrangement, who carry on this adminis-

tration, are appointed in England according to a certain rule and law, and rules are made within the limits of those laws as to what should be their policy. These rules may be good or bad. They may be good, they may be quite well-arranged and methodical. I do not say that they are not. But however good may be the arrangement made by (other) people, still it is not the case that he who wants to have the power to make this arrangement always approve of this. This is the principle of *swarajya*. If you got the powers to select your Collector, it cannot be said with certainty that he would do any more work than the present Collector. Perhaps he may not do. He may even do it badly. I admit this But the difference between these and those is this; this one is selected by us, he is our man, he sees how (lit. in what direction) we may remain pleased; while the other thinks thus: 'what we think to be good must appear so to others.. What is there (with respect to which) we should listen to others ? I am so much educated, I get so much pay, I possess so much ability—why should I do anything which would be harmful to others?' The only answer is 'Because [you] have such conceit.' [Laughter.] There* is one way, there is no rule about it. He whose belly is pinched has no experience about it. This is the only cause of it, there is no other cause. Hence if you minutely consider the various complaints which have arisen in our country [it will appear that] the system which is subsisting now is not wanted by us. Not that we do not want the king, nor that we do not want the English Government nor that we do not want the Em-

*This sentence is not clear in the original.

peror. We want a particular sort of change in the system according to which this administration is carried on, and I for one do not think that if that change were made there would arise any danger to the English rule (lit. kingdom). But there is reason (lit. room) to think that some people whose spectacles are different from ours may see it, because they say so [cheers]. Hence the minds of many people are now directed to the question as to what change should be effected in the system according to which the rule of the English Government is exercised in the above manner. We make minor demands, *viz.*, remove the {liquor} shop in a certain village named Ghodegoan; they would say it should not be removed. Done. [If it is said] reduce the salt tax, they say, we look to the amount of revenue derived from salt duty. If this tax is reduced, how should it be managed there? But he who has to make the arrangement has to do these things. When I ask for the authority to manage my household affairs, I do not say, give me the income which you obtain, and do not spend (it). We ourselves have to make the expenditure, and we too have to collect money: this is the sort of double (lit. united) responsibility which we want. Then we shall see what we have to do. Such is the dispute at present. Other bureaucrats come and say, act according to our wishes; we say, act according to our wishes so that all (our) grievances will be removed. We know that some times a boy obstinately asks for a cap of 25 rupees from his father. Had he been in his father's place it is very doubtful whether he would have paid 25 rupees for the cap or not. The father refuses, but he [the boy] is

grieved at the time. And why is he grieved at it? Because he does not understand (the thing): because the management is not in his hands. Hence the introduction of such an administration is beneficial to India. We want this thing to-day. When this one thing is got the remaining things come into our possession of themselves. This is the one root of the thousands of things which we are asking for. When we get this key into our hands, we can open not only one but 5 or 10 doors at once. Such is the present question. It is in order that the attention of all may be directed to this question that this Home Rule League was established here the other day. Some will be grieved at it; I do not deny it. Every one is grieved. It was said here some time back that when a boy is minor, the father when dying appoints a *panch*. The *panch* when appointed supervises the whole of the estate. Some benefit is also derived from this (arrangement). This is not denied. Afterwards when this boy begins to become a little grown up, he sees that there is something wrong in this. I must acquire the right of management, then I shall carry on better management than this. He is confident of this. Not that he actually carries on the management in that manner. Perhaps, if he be a prodigal he may squander away his father's money. But he thinks as above. In order to avoid any opposition between these two, the law lays down the limitation that (on the boy's) completing 21 years (of his age), the trustee should cease his supervision and give it into the boy's possession. This thing which belongs to practical life applies also to the nation. When the people in the nation become educated and

begin to know how they should manage their affairs, it is quite natural for them that they themselves should manage the affairs which are managed for them by others. But the amusing thing in this history or politics is that the above law about 21 years has no existence in politics. Though we may perhaps somehow imagine a law enjoining that when you have educated a nation for a hundred years you should give its administration into its hands, it is not possible to enforce it. The people themselves must get this effected. They have a right [to do so]. Hence there must be some such arrangement here. Formerly there was some such arrangement to a little extent. Such an arrangement does not exist now. And herein lies the root of all these our demands, the grievances which we have, the wants which we feel [and] the inconveniences which we notice in the administration. And the remedy which is proposed after making inquiries about that root in the above manner is called Home Rule. Its name is *swarajya*. To put it briefly, the demand that the management of our [affairs] should be in our hands is the demand for *swarajya*. Many people [lit. even many people] have at present objections to this. I merely gave the definition in order to make [the subject] clear. The people on the other side always misrepresent it. If there be no mistake in the logical reasoning of what I have now said, how will any mistake arise unless some part of it is misrepresented? Hence, those people who want to point out a mistake misrepresent some sentences out of this and find fault with it saying this is such a thing, this is such a thing. Hence, it is not the duty of a wise man to impute those things to us which

we never demand at all to censure us and in a manner ridicule us before the people. What more shall I say than this? [Cheers.] Hence, if any one of you has such a misconception, let him give it up. At least remember that what I tell is highly consistent. It is in accordanee with logical science. It agrees with history. I said that king means invisible king or Government—this constitutes no offence whatever.* There are deities between. At several times God does not get angry; these deities get angry without reason. Some settlement is to be made with respect to them. Hence if there has arisen any such misconception it should be removed. I have told this for this purpose. Now I tell the nature of it to you. And even before that let us also consider a little the question whether we are fit for [carrying on] such sort of administration or not. Some time ago I gave you the instance of *panch* and their ward. There generally it happens that as the boy grows up more and more, those who think that the management should not pass into other hands make reports that his head has now begun to turn; another says that he is not mad, but that he appears to be half mad. The reason of this is that the management should remain in his hands for a couple of years more. A third says: 'True, you may give authority into his hands but do you know that he has got bad habits?' These [people] tell five or ten things about him. What is to be gained by doing this much? Then the dispute goes before the Court and then they get him adjudged mad. Some things like these have now begun

* This sentence is not clear in the original.

to happen here. To give authority into people's hands is the best principle of administration. No one disputes this; because the same thing is going on in the country of those officials who are here. When they go there they have to advocate the same principle. Therefore no one says that this historical principle is bad. Then what is bad? They distinctly say that the Indians are not to-day fit for *Swarajya* [laughter], and some of us are like the rogues in the story of the three rogues occurring in the Panchatantra. That story is as follows: A villager had come taking a sheep on his head. One rogue said to him 'There is a she-goat on your head.' The second said 'There is a dog on your head.' Third one said quite a third thing. He threw away the sheep. The rogues took it away. Our condition is like that. This relates to human nature. There are among us people who are just like them. Why are we not fit? Because fitness has not been created in us. We have not done [it], our parents have not done it. We too have not got such powers. But the Government has given you some powers in the Council. Sinha [and] Chaubal are in the Council. In the Executive Councils of other places also there are selected people. When these people were selected for appointment, did any one ever say [lit. write] "We are not fit, do not give us the post", No one said. [Cheers]. What then is the use of saying [so] after coming to our meeting? I shall consider that these people are speaking the truth if, when the bureaucracy actually confers some great powers on them, they stand up and say "We do not want them we are not fit for them,—the Brahmins alone must come and perform

Shraddha at our house we cannot perform it." I think that those men who say such things because such and such a person would not like [any particular thing] and bring forward such excuses for that purpose, in a manner make an exhibition of their weak nature [cheers]. Why are we not fit ? Have we no nose, no eyes, no ears, no intellect ? Can we not write ? Have we not read books? Can we not ride a horse ? Why are we not fit ? As a Jew in one of Shakespeare's dramas—asked I ask you what have we not ? You have not done work. If it is not given at all, when are we to do it? [cheers]. Has it ever happened that we did not do work when it was given ? No one did then say, we are unfit, do not appoint us. You appoint them. You get work done by them and afterwards it is also announced in a Government Resolution. 'He has done his duty and so on.'* On the contrary going further, it is to be asked, you bring from England quite a new man of 21 years. What can he do? Has he any experience at all ? He comes all at once and straightway becomes Assistant Collector, and becomes the superior of a Mamlatdar though the latter be 60 years old. Where† a Collector of 21 years? [cheers]. Is 60 years' experience of no value? A man of 21 years comes and begins to teach you. Generally he makes this Mamlatdar of 60 years stand before him. He does not give [him] even a chair for sitting, and this poor man stands before him with joined hands because he has to get Rs. 150, 200, 400

*These words occur in English in the original.

†Not clear in the original.

[cheer]. How then is the Saheb to acquire experience, how is he to become fit, and how is the work [lit. cart] to go on? Has any one thought about this? Had it been true that the people of India are not fit for *swarajya* and that they would not be able to keep their kingdom in good order, then Hindus and Muhammadans would never have governed kingdoms in this country in ancient times. Formerly there were our kingdoms in this country. There were administrators. The proof of this is that before the advent of the English Government in this country there was at least some order, there was no disorder everywhere. One man did not kill another. Since there existed such order, how are we to say that the people are not fit [for powers]? At the present time, science has made progress, knowledge has increased, [and] experience has accumulated in one place. Hence we must have more liberty than before, and we must have become fitter. [But] on the contrary [it is said] we are not fit. Whatever might have been the case in former times, this allegation is utterly false. Better say, [it] is not to be given [cheers]. What I say is, don't apply the words 'not fit' [to us]. At least we shall know that this is not really to be given. We shall get it. But why do we not get it? It is indirectly said that we are not fit. It is to teach you that we have come here. This is admitted. But how long will you teach us? [Laughter]. For one generation, two generations, or three generations! Is there any end to this?......... ....Set some limit. You came to teach us: When we appoint a teacher at home for a boy we ask him within how many days he would teach him—whether in 10, 20

or 25 years. Within two months, within four months. But if the study which should take six months for the boy to finish would, he were to say, contrary to our expectation, take one year, we tell him you are useless, go, we shall appoint another teacher [cheers]. Then in this manner, on the people—on all people.† These officers have control over the people's education and it is their duty to improve them: this duty remains on one side, they make attempts on the other side. They say that whatever attempts they make it is impossible for these people to become fit for this work..............[They are] men like you, as wise as you. You take them in service, get work done by them: it is not that you exercise less strictness. What is going on in the *Khalsa* territory? There is no obstruction in the management. Is it obstructed in Mysore? Who are doing the work? The king of Mysore is a Hindu, the minister is a Hindu, the subjects are, Hindus, the lower officers are Hindus. [They] carry on the administration of such a large kingdom as Mysore, but it is said that the people of the two districts beyond Mysore cannot carry it on in that manner [Laughter, cheers]. There are six districts in the Mysore territory, hence it is like saying that six are fit and eight are not fit. There is fitness in us beyond any doubt [cheers]. You may then, for some reason admit it or not. Well. What authority is there for thinking that we possess fitness? I pointed to a Native State. I tell

---

*Sentence incomplete in the original.

† This sentence is incomplete in the original and the construction of the following six lines is not clear in the original.

another thing. Keep yourself aloof for 10 years and see whether it can be done or not [cheers, laughter]. If it cannot be done take [us] under your control after ten years [cheers]. You are free [to do so]. This thing, too, is not to be done..........There is no *swarajya*. There is no *swarajya*. What does it mean ? What do we ask for? Do we say 'Drive away the English Government ? But I ask what (is it) to the Emperor ? Does the Emperor lose anything whether the administration is carried on by a civil servant or by our Belvi Saheb? [Cheers]. The rule still remains. The Emperor still remains. The difference would be that the white servant who was with him would be replaced by a black servant [cheers]. From whom then does this opposition come? This opposition comes from those people who are in power. It does not come from the Emperor. From the Emperor's point of view their is neither anarchy nor want of loyalty, nor sedition in this. What does *raja-droha* [sedition] mean? Hatred of the King. Does 'King' mean a police sepoy? [Laughter]. I said some time back that this distinction must first be made. Otherwise, [lit. then].if tomorrow you say 'remove the police sepoy' would it constitute sedition? Such is the belief of police sepoys [laugher]. In the same manner go up a little and you will see that the demand made by us is right, proper, just and conformable to human nature. The same has been done by other nations. It has not been done only in our country. *Swarajya, swarajya*—what does it mean? Not that you do not want the Ehglish rule. There is a mistake at the root. Some one has some object in it. This argument is brought

4517

forward by men whose interest lies in deceiving you. Do not care about it at all.

'If you think that you are men like other men, when they go to England their intellect and they are put to the test there. Therein we stand higher. What else then comes out? Your intellect may be good, but you do not possess character, courage and other qualities [and] their nature. I admit for a ghatka [24 minutes] the absence of nature. But it does not follow that it will not be acquired (laughter). How can their nature at all become such, whose life is spent in service and in service alone ? If it be said he worked as a clerk for 25 years, wrote on the cover (*sic*) the Saheb's orders, obtained the Saheb's signature thereon, and then he acquired the habit after 25 (40) years*; still, he will at first find it difficult to do work this is not denied. But when the system under which such men are has disappeared, it cannot be said that men would not become fit in the next generation. Hence in my opinion we are fit for *Swarajya*. I shall now briefly tell you what we wish to obtain and what we should demand and conclude my speeech.

"Yo know of what sort the Indian administration is. But the thing to be told is that it is carried on in accordance with a particular law. Its rules are fixed. What are the powers of the Secretary of State ? What are the powers of the Governor-General ? There are three great parts of the system. The Secretary of State is in England. The Governor-General is at Delhi in India. Under him there is a Governor for a Presidency. For

* The sentence is not clear in the original.

the present let us omit those under him. But the main system is of the above three sorts. If we now begin to consider each, who appoints the Secretary of State? Not we. This arrangement was made according to the policy of the Company's government. When there was the East India Company's rule in this country, all matters were carried on on a commercial principle. The whole attention was directed towards (the question) how might the Company's shareholders obtain a considerable profit; the Company's Directors were in the place of the present Secretary of State. You might say that this was a contract given for governing the entire kingdom. Under-the Peshwa's rule Mamlatdar's offices were given under a contract. This Indian administration was, as it were, according to the then law of Government, a trade carried on by the East India Company. They were to derive from it as much profit as possible. The Company's Directors were to be in England. Their attention was directed to the fact that profit was to be given to the Directors, *i. e.*, share-holders. A letter used to come to the Governor-General here to this effect:—So much profit must be paid to us this year. Realise it and send it to us.' This was the administration. The people's good was not (considered) in it. (It was like) the milkman and his cows. If the cows do not give milk, he says bring (the pot) after filling it by pouring water in it. The administration of India was carried on like that. Subsequently it appeared after discussion that this administration was not of a good sort. And when Queen Victoria—you may say the Parliament—took the administration in their

hands, they did not approve of this trading system. They took it into their hands—this was one part. This system of administration has been formed in accordance with the commercial policy which was in existence when the administration was assumed (by the Parliament) and under which the Directors were in England and their servants were here. The State Secretary has come in the place of the Directors. The Governor-General (has) come in the place of their Governor. Thus what was done ? The Sovereign—the Parliament—took the administration into their hands, but the establishment of employees which then existed has remained just as before. This happened in 1858 after the mutiny. From that time to this the administration of India has been carried on in accordance with rules and arrangement formed according to the Company's policy. If it was really to go to the king. * As there was the sovereign this nature of the Company should have disappeared. He is the King and we are his subjects. It is his duty to rule for the good of the subjects. And an arrangement should be made in accordance with the rules—lawful—that may be included in that duty. But this arrangement was made thus—the Directors went, the Secretary of State came in his place. Who is to decide how much money is to be spent in India and what taxes are to be imposed ? The State Secretary. Such powers are not placed in the Governor-General's hands. He is the chief officer. The Governors are under him. He is a servant. There are other servants under him. And the entire administration must be carried on with

* The sentence is incomplete in the original.

the consent of, in consultation with and with the advice of this State Secretary. Such is the present policy. What happened then ? Gradually. * This is but a commercial policy. Thouh the administration went into the hands of the Queen's Government, and though they issued a great proclamation, the sovereign's pclicy is not on the lines of that proclamation. The sovereign's policy is in accordance with the trading Company's policy, the administration of the Kingdom is in accordance with the Company's policy. And in the meantime the proclamation has no effect. [Laughter, cheers] Such was the arrangement. At that time our people did not know [it] I think that had the spread of education been then as great as it is now, the people would have contended that since the Queen had taken the reins of Government into her own hands, the administration of the kingdom should, as regards the sovereign and the subjects, be for the good of the subjects. Our people would then have told that the arrangement made by the Company was simply for its own benefit, and that a change must be made in that policy—in that arangement. The people continued to make these contentions fot many years. To put the matter very briefly, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji (cheers], who is one of those living persons who saw this arrangement and pointed out its defects, began this work. What beginning did he make ? He said 'What is the difference between the Company's [system] and this [system]? We do not [see] any in it. The rules are all made in accordance with the Company's policy. Are the people likely to derive any benefit

* The sentence is incomplete in the original.

from them? ' Then arose these Lagislative Councils. They were such that the Governor-General was to appoint us. Originally [the members] were not to be elected [lit. appointed] by the people. Gradually your men became members [lit. officers] of the Municipality and of the Legislative Council. Still the final keys are in their own hands. Discussion may be held in the Legislative Council. You have full liberty to hold a discussion. You may hold a discussion about spending the money in this country. We shall decide whether it should be [so] spent or not. Subject your mouth and mind to as much exertion as possible, we have no objection to it. Be awake throughout the night, prepare yout speeches. Instead of prfnting them in a newspaper, we shall publish them in the "Bombay (Government) Gazette." This is the only difference. Nothing is got from this. The hope of getting is held out. There is a *shlok* (stanza) in the *Mahabharat* which says 'hope should be made dependent upon time.' Rights are to be given to you when you become fit. We do not wish to remain in India. When you become fit, we shall give the bundle into your possession and go to England by the English steamer (cheers). Such a time limit should by laid down. We shall give in two years. We shall give in ten years. Such a time came afterwards. Time shuld be coupled with obstacles.' Ten years were mentioned. These days passed and were very wearisome. We are obliged to make them fifteen. 'Hope and time should be coupled with an obstacle. An-obstacle came. You yourselves must have brought it. We did not bring it. We were awaiting good time (an excuse should be

coupled with it). The excuse came. How did it even come ? It is an excuse, nothing can be said about it. Some quite different cause should be shown. This is a sort of policy. When you do not mean to give, how do you speak ? It is not the case that this is written in the modern works on morality and politics. Only the old tradition has continued. Thus this bureaucracy has been cajoling us. For the last 5 or 50 years the State Secretary and the Govrnor-General too have been cajoling us in this manner—have kept us afloat. As soon as you proceed to make some noise, (it is said) there were five members, to-morrow we shall make them six. What is the benefit to us of raising the number from five to six ? One of our men is only to be made to pass time there for nothing for a few days (cheers). There is no more advantage than this. (If) you object to six (they say) we make them eight. We raise our 10 to 12, if necessary. (Laughter and cheere.) The people are already convinced that this matter cannot be disposed of in this manner. Whatever rights you may have to give, give them to us absolutely, however great your own powers may be. If the management of the Educational Department alone be considered (it will be found that) most of the subordinate servants are from among us only. There is a Saheb at the head. Why is he kept there ? With a view to restrain their mouths and the scope of their intellect. Even if 20 years' service be put in, the work will not be done without the Saheb, that poor man begins to say so. Such men are to be prepared............................Two distinctions are to be seen in these. When a gardener is asked by some one

to prepare a garden here beyond this (place) he looks for (flower) pots. when big forests are to be prepared under the Forest Department, pots are not required. Bags of seed are brought and emptied. Trees grow everywhere to any extent. Some (of them) grow small, some big. This present arrangement is like that. Owing to this arrangement the trees amongst us do not grow. Nay, care is taken that the trees, planted in pots look pretty (and) their flowers can be plucked by the hand. He is educated in such a way that* such pretty trees may grow. In such a manner is he treated and made to work. And then after 25 or 30 years are past he begins to say 'I am really not fit for this work.' We do nat want this system. We want the English Government. We want to remain under the shelter (lit. umbrella)* of this rule. But we do not want the State Secretary who has been created as a son-in-law (cheers) At least we want our men, (men) elected by us in his council. This is the first reform that must be made. Similarly it must be decided according to our opinion who is to expend India's (revenues), how much money he is to collect (and) how many taxes he is to impose (cheers.) We say, there must not be those taxes. They will say how will the expenditure be met? That we will see ofterwards. We know so much that expenditure is to be made according to the money (we) may have and (lit. or) that money has to be raised according to the expenditure undergone. We understand this. We will afterwards see what arrangement (should be made). The second principle of Home Rull is that these

* This is not clear in the original.

powers should be in the people's hands, in the hands of good men, *viz.*, in the hands of men elected by the people. At present such a (great) war is going on in Europe. The Emperor does not decide how much money has to be spent on the war. Mr. Asquith decides it. If there is a complaint against the work done by Mr. Asquith, it goes before Parliament, and if Mr. Asquith has commited a mistake, he has to tender his resignation. Will it be sedition if he has to tender his resignation? There is difference in the arrangement, there is difference in the organization, there is difference in the system. And we are asking for such a change in the system. The rule will fall, the rule will go away—these thoughts are utterly foreign to us, they do not come within our limits, our reach, our view. And we do not also wish it. I again say, if the nation is to get happiness, if the thousands of complaints that have risen to-day are to be removed, then first of all, change his system of administration. There is a saying in Marathi 'Owing to what did the horse become restive? Owing to what did the betel-leaves rot? Owing to what did the bread get burnt? There is one answer to it.' Owing to not turning. The leaves ought to have been turned, the bread ought to have been turned. Had the horse been turned, it would not have become restive.' The root of it is that, complaints about forests, complaints about Abkari, complaints about Kulkarni Vatans—(these have arisen) because authority is not in our hands. To state it in slightly changed words—because (we have) not *swarajya* (cheers). That we should have *swarajya* for us is at the root of it. Then (we) need not danc

according to the wish of any one. This may happen even in *swarajya.* I do not deny it. When we have deficiency of money and powers are placed in your hands, you will increase the tax; you will increase (it) altogether voluntarily. Whence is the expenditure to be met? But as it will be increased voluntarily, it will not oppress our minds. Learned aliens may tell us, when we are passing like this through this door, that we should not pass through this door but through that, but if any one comes and stands there and (begins to) tell us not to go through it, then we have to go out by giving him a push. The very same is the case with *swarajya.* This is the obstruction of the bureaucracy. We do not want such obstruction. The demand for *Swarajya* is such that it has nothing to do with sedition. It has nothing to do also with the invisible Government. This domestic arrangement should be managed by you yourselves and by doing so what will happen is that in the first place your minds will remain in peace. Whatever you have to do you will do with the thought that you are doing it for your good. Nay, you will also reduce the expenditure. I do not think that in any Native State a Collector does not* get a pay of twentyfive hundred rupees. If there is any place in the world in which a man doing the work of a Collector gets the highest pay, it is India (cheers). To give 2,500 rupees as pay to a Collector would, under the former rule, have been like giving an annual *jahagir* of Rs. 30,000? Have we ever given in our Swarajya such a jahagir of Rs. 30,000? Rs. 30,000 is not a small amount. There are reasons

---

*Sic.

for it. What reason is given? Bear it in mind that there is some reason or another for everything. This (man) has to send Rs. 2,500 to England for his children, etc. For your welfare (they) come from a cold climate to a hot climate (and) get their health spoilt. Must not then pay be given to them? They have laboured so much, made such self-sacrifice, (and) suffered so many hardships, and you would not pay them money? When this is once told it appears to be right at first sight. But now the principal question is, who told them to come here from there? (Cheers.) We did not call (them). You do such work as you may be fit to do. We do (lit. may) possess as much fitness as you have, but we shall be able to do the work on less pay. Men can be had. Then why [give] so much pay to him? We don't need it. We think that we do not get to-day money for education. The excuse of 'no funds' which is brought forward in connection with the execution of works of public utility will first disappear. The business will go on unobstructed just as at present. In the beginning it will not go on so unobstructed. Perhaps it may be less by an anna in the ruppee. Still the good impression [lit. fine thing] that will be produced by [the thought] that the [business] has been carried on by the people, is of greater value. In this manner good management is to be asked for in this [administration]. Amedment is to be brought about in the peresent law; it is to be brought about through Parliament. We will not ask for it from others. We have not to get this damand complied with petitioning France. The Allies may be there, we have not to petition them. The petition is to be made to the

English people, to the English Parliament. This state [of things] is to be placed before them. We have to do whatever may be required for this. If you carry on such an effort now for 5 or 25 years, you will never fail to obtain its fruit. Moreover, such a time has now arrived on account of the war that is now going on that some such effort must be made as will increase the value of India, India's bravery, India's courage, and India's stability. If the fact that they themselves are making this effort comes to the notice of Government, then there is hope of our demand soon proving fruitful. I have, therefore, purposely brought this subject before you. The subject is being discussed elsewhere also. The League which we have established for this purpose is such that I myself or some one else will have occasion to place the subject [before the people] at every place, if not to-day some days afterwards, for carrying on this work. Let this subject be always discussed by you, always think about it, get its usefulness explained, and carefully consider how much of loyalty and how much of disloyalty is in it. This is what I tell you on the present occasion. Though what I have to say may be much more than this still I have told you its substance in a brief manner. If the consideration of this begun among you, be begun in Maharashtra, be begun in India, then some day or other this work will succeed; and even if this matter lies in God's hands still it is necessary. I admit that it does not lie in our hands. But the effect of action (lit. *karma*) cannot fail to take place in this world. The effect of action may not be obtained so soon as I say may not be obtained before my eyes, perhaps I may not

be benefited by it. But this action must have its fruit (cheers). According to the law of action, when a certain action is done, another results from it, (and) a third one results out of that. Such succession goes on. Time will be required, there will be delay. But do we ask at all that we should have *Moksha** before our eyes? Again do we ask for it with the thought that we should have it at the hands of a certain person? Only just now a Resolution was passed in our conference (that) the parties of Moderates and Nationalists are not wanted. That is to say, it is the same to us to whomsoever *swarajya* is given. There is no objection even if powers be given to your sepoy to-morrow. You may say, how will the sepoy exercise such a great power? The sepoy is to die some day or other and then we will see (cheers). We want rights. We want a certain sort of arrangement giving happiness. We will get it. Our children will get it. Make the effort that is to be made. Be ready to do this work with the thought that it belongs to you. I am sure that by the grace of God your next generation will not fail to obtain the fruit of this work, though it may not be obtained in your life-time (cheers).

Mr. Tilak's First Speech at Ahmednagar.

31st May, 1916.

Mr. Chaukar, Pleader, said :—

Gentlemen, this is a very fortunate day for our town. To-day we shall have the benefit of listening to Mr. Tilaks (cheers) lectar like advice. Hence, without saying any-

*i. e., deliverance of the soul from the body.

thing more about it now, I request you to hear, with undisturbed mind and without making any noise his discussion of the subject on which he is going to speak and to make up your mind to act in accordance with it, and request you (referring to Tilak*) to begin your lectur (cheers).

"Gentlemen, before saying a few words to you it is my first duty to thank you very much. It is my first duty to thank you for the honour you have done to me by calling me here and for the address you have presented to me. Whatever the motive with which you have conferred the honour upon me, the few words, which I have now to tell you, relate to my work. Perhaps this may appear strange (lit. contrary) to you. You have called me here and (if) I make a statement about my own work before you, that would be a sort of impropriety. Should you think that Mr. Tilak came here and told people his own things (I say) I do not hesitate at all to tell them at this place since the things which I have to tell you are of as grate an advantage to you as they are to me. Till now controversies and discussions about the state of our conutry have taken place in various ways and at various places. What is beneficial to the people in general? Many things are beneficial. Religion, which relates to the other world, is beneficial. Similarly, morality too is beneficial Provision for one's maintenance is beneficial. Our trade should expand, the population should increase, there should be plenty and that plenty should safely fall into our hands—all these things are desired by men. But it

* These words are in English and enclosed in brackets in the original.

is not possible to discuss all these things in the short time allowed to me. I will, therefore, say a few words before you about such of the above things as are important and are considered important by thousands of people (and) about† a subject which is now discussed on all sides. This subject is *swarajya* (Cheers). Those things which relate to our homes we do authoritatively in our homes. If I desire to do such and such a thing, if it be merely a private one, I have not to ask any one about it nor to take anybody's permission nor is it necessary to consult any one else. That is not the case in public matters. As is our own good just so is the good of all people. If we consider how people would begin to live well and how they would attain a condition of progressive improvement we shall see that whatever things we take (for consideration), we are handicapped in consequence of there being no authority in our hands. If a railway is to be constructed from one place to another, that is not under our control. As for trade, I might talk much about giving encouragement to such and such an industry but it is not wholly in our power to acquire knowledge of that industry at the place where it is carried on to lesson the trade of those people in this country and increase our own trade. Whatever thing we may take it is the same with it. We cannot stop [the sale of] liquor. There are also some things which are not wanted by us or by our Government, but the course of the general administration is such that it is not in our power to make any change,—

‡ The construction not clear in the original.

the slightest change,—in it. We have till now made many complaints and Government have heard them ; but what is the root of all the complaints ? What things come in the way of improving our condition as we desire [and] what is our difficulty,—this has been considered for about 50 years past, and many wise people have, after considering this thing, discovered one cause of this, which is that our people have no authority in their hands. In public matters, different [lit. many] people have different opinions. Some say, 'Do you not possess authority ? Do not drink liquor, and [all] is done.' The advice is good [lit. sweet] indeed, but stopping all the people [from drinking liquor] cannot be done by mere advice. This requires some authority. He who has not got that authority in his hands cannot do that work. And if it had been possible to do the work. And if it had been possible to do the work by mere advice, then we would not have wanted a king. Government [administration] has come into existence for giving effect to the things desired by a large number of people. And as that Government is not in our hands, if anything is desired by thousands of you but not by those who control the administration, that thing can never ce accomplished. I had come here on a former occasion. What about the famine administration (of that time)? When (lit. on which day) Government came to know that the weavers sustained great loss during famine, some steps were taken about it. We have lost our trade. The business of commission agency used to be carried on formerly; it is not that commission agency (business) did not exist before, nor that it does not exist now. The business of

the agents is carried on at present. The difference is that while at that time you were the commission agents of our trade, you have (now) become the commission agents of the business men of England. You buy cotton here and send it to England and when the cloth made from it in England arrives, you buy it on commission and sell it to us. The business of commission agency has remained, but what has happened in it is that the profit which this country derived from it, is lost (to us) and goes to the English. The thing (is) that the men and the business are the same (as before) but owing to a change in the ruling power, we cannot do some things. Such has become (the condition) that such things as would be beneficial to the country cannot be carried out. At first we thought that since the English Government was as a matter of fact alien, (and) there was no sedition in calling them so, there would be no sedition whatever nor any (other) offence in calling (alien) those things which are alien. What is the result of alienness? The difference between aliens and us is that the aliens' point of view is alien, their thoughts are alien, and their general conduct is such that their minds are not inclined to particularly benefit those people to whom they are aliens. The Muhammedan kings who ruled here at Ahmednagar (I don't call Muhammedan kings who ruled here at Ahmednagar (I don't call Muhammedans aliens) come to and lived in this country and at least desired that local industries should thrive. The religion may be different. The children of him who wishes to live in India, (also) wish to live in India. Let them remain. Those are not aliens who desire to do good to

those children, to that man, and other inhabitants of India. By alien I do not mean alien in religion. He who does what is beneficial to the people of this country, be he a Muhammedan or an Englishman, is not alien. 'Aiienness' has to do with interests. Alienness is certainly not concerned with white and black skin. Alienness is not concerned with religion. Alienness is not concerned with trade and profession. I do not consider him an alien who wishes to make an arrangement whereby that country in which he has to live, his children have to live and his future generations have to live, may see good days and be benefited. He may not perhaps go with me to the same temple to pray to God, perhaps there may be no intermarriage and interdining between him and me. All these are minor questions. But if a man is exerting himself for the good of India, and takes measures in that direction, I do not consider him an alien.........................At first I thought that there was nothing particular in this. The Peshwa's rule passed away and the Muhammedan rule passed away; (the country) came into the possession of the English, but the king's duty is to do all those things whereby the nation may become eminent, be benefited, rise, and become the equal of other nations. That king who does this duty is not alien. He is to be considered alien, who does not do this duty, but looks only to his own benefit, to the benefit of his own race. and to the benefiit of his original country......................At fiirst hundreds of questions arose. Agricultural asssessment then increased, the Forest Department was organised in a particular manner, the Abkari Department was organised in a particular

manner,—About all these things we have been constantly complaining to Government for the past 20 or 25 years. (But) no arrangements about the different departments, the different professions, the different trades and the different industries, were made [accordingly]. This is the chief question of the past 50 years. While looking out for a cause of this, we at first believed that when we informed this Government of it, it would at once proceed to do as we desired. The Government is alien. It does not know (the facts). When 5 or 10 of our prominent men assembling together tell Government, the latter will understand it. It being alien, it cannot understand it. As soon as the Government is informed of this, it is so generous minded and wise that it will listen to what you have to say and redress (the grievances). Such was our belief. But the policy (lit. conduct) of Government during the last 50 years has been the cause of the removal of this belief. However much you may clamour, however much you may agitate, whatever the number of grounds you may show, its sight is so affected as not to see the figures drawn from its own reports and set before it. The same arguments and the same grounds do not meet with its approval. If we say anything to it, it sticks only to what may be adverse to our statement. Perhaps some one may come and tell you that there is nothing to wonder at in this. Whether the Muhammedans or the Hindus or the Peshwas or the Emperor of Nagar may have been (may be) your rulers, those kingdoms have been broken up and now the rule of the English has been established. Of course those people do just what is beneficial to them,

Why then do you complain about them ? This is sure to happen. Such is the opinion of several people. This your outcry only becomes the cause of giving pain to Government and in a manner disturbing its mind. For this reason do not raise this outcry and accept quietly what it may give. Accept gladly what little (lit. quarter of bread) it may give and thank it. Such is the opinion of several people. I do not approve of this opinion. My opinion is that whatever be the Government whether British or any other, it has, as Government, a sort of duty to perform. Government has a sort of religious duty to perform; a sort af responsibility lies on its shoulders. I say that when a Gavernment evades this responsibility it is no Government at all. Government possesses authority. All the power possessed by Government, be it acquired by it by fighting or be it conferred (upon it) by the people......* Still Government has a duty (to perform). As we have a duty, so those who are called Government have also a duty. They must do certain things. The Government has already admitted certain duties. Does not Government do such works as constructing roads, establishing Post-offices and telegraphs ? It does. If tomorrow some one were to say 'If Government does not construct roads, it is its pleasure. It may construct them if it likes, but not if it does not like,' then all of you who are assembled here we find fault with him saying, 'If these things are not to be done by Government, why do we pay taxes ? If the Government will not utilise for the people's conveniences taxes

* The sentence is incomplete in the original.

levid from us, it has no authority to take any taxes whatever from us. Government take these for our benefit. When any persons argue before you that the Government is good, what do they show ? The question is always asked 'This our Government has constructed roads, made railways, established telegraphs and post offices—are not these conveniences made for you ? Why do you then raise an outcry against Government ?' I do not say that these things have not been done, but that those that have been done are not sufficient. These things have been done, done well and have been done better by the British Government than they would have been done by the former Governments—this is an honour to them. But should we not tell it to do these things which it does not do ? But that is not a real Government which considers itself insulted when told of those things which have not been done and a desire to do which is not apparent even now, which does not direct its attention to them though told in many ways, and which thinks that we should not tell those things to it. What then is meant by a real Government ? This must be considered a little. There is a vast difference between the present system and the old system. At present an effort is being made to create a sort of erroneous conception. Neither the Collector nor the civilians arriving (here), who are called the bureaucracy in English, are Government. A police sepoy is not Government. It does not constitute any sedition whatever to say, 'Do something if it can be done, while maintaining the British rule which is over our country, without harm being done to that rule and without weakening it.' We want the

rule of theEnglish which is over us. But we do not want these intervening middlemen lit. Keepers of granaries (cheers). The grain belongs to the master, the provisions belong to the master. But remove the intervening middlemen's aching belly, and confer those powers upon the people so that they may duly look to their domestic affairs. We ask for *swarajya* of this kind. This *swarajya* does not mean that the English Government should be removed, the Emperor's rule should be removed and the rule of some one of our (Native States should be established in its place.). The meaning of *swarajya* is that explained by Mr. Khaparde at Belgaum, *viz.*, we want to remove the priests of the deity. The deities are to be retained. These priests are not wanted. We say appoint other priests from amongst us. These intervening Collectors, Commissioners and other people are not wanted. Who at present exercises rule over you ? The Emperor does not come and exercise it. He is in England. If some facts were communicated to him, it is his wish that good shouid be done to you. Why then is not good done to you ? Hence we do not want these priests (cheers).* Those people are clever. You say that no priest is wanted. They will say 'We have passed examinations. We do many things'. All things are true. But their attention is directed more to the remuneration† belonging to the priest. Hence this priestly office should ramain in our hands. The position of the

---

* The word is in English in the original.

† The original word is Vrityansh which means a co-share of an estate, office or occupation as a means of subsistence.

Badwas‡ of Pandharpur and these (people) is the same (cheers).§ Will there be any loss to the Emperor if the said priestly office does not remain in the hands of the bureaucracy who are endeavouring to retain it ? There will be none. Some will say that the English people belong to the Emperor's race. But after we have become the Emperor's subjects he does not make any distinction between the English subjects and the black subjects. He does not wish to make it. The meaning of the words *swarajya* is Municipal Local Self-Government. But that is a farce. It is not sufficient. When an order comes from the Collector, you have to obey it. He (Collector)* has power to meddle. He has power to call the President and tell him to do such and such a thing. If the President does not do it, the Collector has power to remove him. Then where is the *swarajya* ? (cheers).† The meaning of *swarajya* (as stated) above is retention of our Emperor and the rule of the English people, and the full possession by the people of the authority to manage the remaining affairs. This is the definition of *swarajya*. What we ask for is not that the authority of the English should be lessened, nor that the English Government should go away and the German Government should come in its place. On the contrary, the present war has proved and the whole world has seen that it is not our wish that the German Government should come here. Nay, in order that the rule of this Government should

‡ The priest of Vithoba's temple at Pandharpur.

The word is in English in the original.

* The word is in English and enclosed in brackets in the original.

remain here permanently, thousands of our people are to-day sacrificing their lives in the most distant and cold climes (here, here, cheers).† What is left then ? If in order that this rule may remain and that this rule should not go away and the rule of the German people should not come in its place, we pay money—be it according to our means—though we are not as wealthy as the English......‡ According to our ability, our fighting men are going (there) and sacrificing their lives and in this way exerting themselves. France, Germany and (lit. or) other nations commending and applauding them. [cheers, hear, hear] By shedding our blood we have proved our desire that our loyalty to the English Government should be of this kind [hear, hear and cheers]. I do not think that any man can adduce stronger evidence than this in his favour. Thus to-day it is an undoubted fact that we want here the rule of the English alone and accordingly we are exerting ourselves. If such is the state of things, why should not these intervening people who have been appointed be removed and why should we not get the rights possessed by the people in other places within the British Empire ? We are not inferior to them in point of bravery and education, we possess ability. Such being the case, why should we not get the rights? Why should the Emperor make a distinction between his black and white subjects ? Who has given such advice to the Emperor ? The peculiar feature of the British consti-

---

These words are in English and enclosed in brackets in the original.

‡ The sentence is left incomplete here inthe original.

tution [lit. rule] is that the Emperor acts on the advice of the people. Why should the ministers give him such advice? At present those who possess power, i. e., the bureaucracy, are white. When a black man goes among them he too becomes like them. Under the present system, if a native on his arrival from England after passing examination be appointed to be a Collector, he after going among them becomes just like them. Do not think that I am speaking only about the white. We do not want this system. What does it matter if a man or two goes among them? He connot do anything in particular. Therefore this system must be done away with. We would not be satisfied by the appointment of one or two persons. Let that be. Who introduced the system? The Emperor did not introduce it. The Queen's proclamation as promulgated is of one sort [lit. on one side] and the present system is of another sort [lit. on one side]. At present it is not all left in our hands to bring about our own good. Were we to think that encouragement should be given to swadeshi goods by imposing duty on certain imported foreign goods, that is not in our hands. Were we to think of starting such and such industries required in this country [or] of importing paid teachers from foreign countries, that thing is not in onr hands. What a small thing this is! It is necessary that all people should know reading and writing. Whether a man be a Muhammadan or of any [other] religion or of any caste, he ought to know a little of reading and writing. This thing is now acknowledged by all people throughout the world. There is now no doubt about this. By knowing reading and writing a

man derives at least some benefit. No one requires to be told of this anew. Then why is not that thing done here ? Because there is no money. Who gives this excuse ? This excuse is given by the bureaucracy. Their pay is Rs. 2,500 and if it is to be raised to 3,000, then there is money. The same was the case with exchange compensation. When the price of the rupees or [silver]* fell, six crores of rupees were brought out by Government on account of exchange. At that time money was found. Unless you have authority in your hands these things which are taking place cannot be got over. There is no money for education, but [lit. and] there is money to pay a salary of Rs. 2,500 to the Collector. To whatever degree of clearness we speak about and tell this thing......* Moreover the present bureaucracy does not consider that thing from the point of view from which we would consider it if authority were to come into our hands. At first we were told that money should be spent on education. When people being to know how to read and write the number of offences committed falls by the thousands, they carry on their dealings well ; they understand what is of advantage and what is of disadvantage to them. When people become fit in this manner an officer of Rs. 2,500 will not be necessary to govern them. One of Rs. 500 will do and we shall be able to spend Rs. 2,000 on education. In no other country are there so highly paid officers at present. The Viceroy who comes to govern India

---

* The brackets occur here in the original,

* Sentence incomplete here in the original.

gets Rs. 20,000 a month, while the Prime Minister of England gets Rs. 5,000. He who remaining in England manages the affairs of the whole Empire gets Rs. 5,000, while he who carries on the administration of India here gete Rs. 20, 000. Why so ? There is no answere to this. This is so because this thing is managed at the cost of others (lit. direct) (cheers). * This is India. Go and eat. If any shop belonging to other people is made over to you for management, you will pay the employee a salary of Rs. 100 if he belongs to your community or caste while you would pay him a pay of Rs. 50 in your own shop.† In this way the present arrangement is being carried on. We are not at all benefited by this arrangement. Thus it is not the case that these things have come to our notice for the first time. It is 50 years since the things came to our notice. When the National Congress was held at Calcutta in 1906, Mr Dadabhai Navrojy [cheers] stated this distinctly. He gave it as his 50 years' experience that for counteracting this present irregularity and the sort of injustice that is taking place in India, there is no other remedy than that the power should pass into the people's hands. He called it Self-Government. And in the hands of the people.‡ We must decide upon the arrangment as regards what is to be done in our homes, what is to be done in our villages, what is to be done in our country and what is to be done in our presidency. If we decide

* This word occurs in English in the original.

†The construction of this sentence is confused in the originol. But the general sense appears to be as given.

‡ These words have no connection with what follows.

about this, it will be done at a small cost, it will be done well, and our decision as regards in what matter we should expend more money, and in what matter less, will be more beneficial to the people. The bureaucracy says that we do not possess knowledge as if they alone possess it. Their first look-out is to see how their pay will be secure. When money comes into the treasury the expense on occount of their pay must be first defrayed. Their military expenditure must be first defrayed. They must be first fully provided for. If money remains after this, it is to be applied to education. They do not say that education is not wanted. Education is not a bad thing in their eye. But the people are to be educated and there other conveniences are, if possible, to be looked to after all (the above) expenditure is defrayed. This is to be thought of afterwards. We shall first consider whether [you could] manage things or not if power were to come into your hands It you think that more pay has to be paid to these people then reduce it and tell them that they will have to do the work for the country. When all these things will be considered in this manner, we shall have in our hands the opportunity of bringing about those things which it is desirable to bring about. This is mere speculation [lit. consideration]. Where is your difficulty? There is a common saying in Marathi: A certain man asked three questions. Why (lit. where) does the horse become restive, why did betel leaves rot—the story cccurs in the third book: it was there formerly, I do not khow whether it is there now.—He gave a single answer to two or three such questions, which is, 'owing to not turning.' Similarly, (why) is (not) the consum-

ption of liquor reduced in our presidency, why are the people subjected to *zulum* in forests, why is money not available for education ?—All these questions have one answer and it is this: 'Because you have no power in your hands' [cheers]* and so long as this power wil not come into your hands, so long there will also be no dawn of your good fortune. Whoever may be the Emperor we speak not anything about him. But we must do those things which relate to business, trade, religion and society. Unless the power of doing those things comes partially into our hands—in the end it must come fully—unless it comes fully into our hands, it is impossible for us to see a time of plenty, the dawn of good fortune, advantage or prosperity. Water cannot be drunk with others' mouths. We ourselves have to drink it. Similar is the present arrangement that of drinking with others' mouths. We ourselves must draw our water—the water of our well—and drink it. If that well belongs to Government a tax of a rupee a month may, if necessary, be paid. But we want power. There are no means of salvation for us unless we have it in our possession. This principle of politics is almost settled—proved—from the point of view of history, morality and social science. Now (lit. then) you may ask why it was told to you for so many days. I have to say a few words about this. That power should come into our hands or the time of its coming into your hands is approaching (lit. beginning to be seen).‡ Up till now the generality of people in England thought of deriving as

* This word occurs in English in the original.

‡ Sentence is not clear in the original.

much profit from India as possible [and that] India was a sort of burden to them. The people in England used to think that the 30 crores of people in India would overthrow their rule some time or other [that] they should be disarmed [and that] they must be kept in slavery and under control as much as possible. But that condition is now changed. Owing to the war which is now going on in Europe, it has begun to be thought that unless all the many parts of the British Empire unite together, the Empire would not attain as much strength as it should. It has so happened now that a consciousness has been awakened in them that they stand in need of aid from other countries called colonies belonging to them—Australia, Canada, [and] New Zealand, which are inhabited by Sahebs. If you take advantage of this awakened consciousness, you too have this opportunity of acquiring some rights. No one tells you to obtain these rights by the use of the sword. But to-day the nation's mind has undergone a change. India can give some help to England. If India be happy England too will acquire a sort of glory, a sort of strength and a sort of greatness. This consciousness has been awakened in England. If no advantage is taken of this awakened consciousness at this time, such an opportunity will not occur again. The bureaucracy considers this to be bad. Who will be the loser in this? Not the Emperor, but the bureaucracy. They, therefore, consider this thing to be bad, and they are now telling [lit. advising] us that we are not fit for *swarajya*, and that, therefore they have come here. As if there was no *swarajya* anywhere in India when they were not here! We all were barbarians and

ready to cut each other's throats. There was no system of administration under the Peshwa's regime! There was no system of administration under Muhammadan regime! We were not able to carry on State administration, we were not able to construct roads. We did not know how the people might be happy. Nana Phadnavis wasa fool, Malik Amber was a fool, Akber and Aurangzeb were fools. Therefore these people have come here for your good and you are still children [laughter]. Let us admit for a moment also that you are children. When are you now to become grown up? In law when one attains his 21st year, one is considered to be grown up. Though these [people] have ruled over us for 50 years we have not been able to become grown up. What then did they do for 50 years? If the people of India were children whose duty was it to educate [lit. make wise] them? It was their duty. They were the rulers. I go so far as to say that they have not done their duty—hence ot only are we children, but they are unfit to rule cheers]. This alone is good that those people who ould not improve [the condition of] their subjects during 0 years should give up their power and make it over to thers. If there be a manager of your shop and if he erformed the duty of *munim* for 50 years, but there was nly loss continuously for 5o years, what would you tell im? Sir, give up your place and go away. We shall ɔok to our own management. Another may be of a ɔwer grade. Though he may be less clever, he will at ɛast know that in managing a shop there should at least e no loss. This at least he must know. What [those] eople tell us, *viz.*, that we have not become fit, proceeds

from selfishness. If what they say be true, it is in a way disgraceful to them. They are being proved to be unfit. And if it be false, they are selfish. We can draw no other conclusion from this than the above. What is meant by 'we are unfit'? What is the matter with us? Our municipal management is tolerated. If someone comes from England after passing examination and becomes a Collector that is tolerated. They discharge their duties and Government commends them. But when the rights of *swarajya* are to be given to the people, to tell all people, crores of people plainly, that they are unfit [lit. to give a certificate of unfitness] is to make an exhibition of one's own unfitness [cheers]. * Besides this, objections of many other sorts are taken against *swarajya*. In the first place, I have already said they unhesitatingly [lit. atonce] decide that the whole nation is unfit. If we say, 'hold an examinaticn' no examination too is held. Unfit, unfit—what does it mean? Set your men to work and set our men also to work. See whether they do or do not work properly. No opportunity to work is given and yet we are called unfit. Are even those, who have been given an opportunity, found unfit? There are members in the Legislative Council, are they unfit? Have they ever called themselves unfit? Have you ever called them unfit? No what does then unfit mean? You don't mean to give. In order to say there is no buttermilk, is deceit necessary? To-day being Sunday, there is no buttermilk—such is the shuffling that is going on now. I want

* This word is in English in the original.

to ask you whether you without allowing that shuffling are prepared or not to make a resolute demand. If you are not prepared to ask, if you do not make urgent solicitation about this,—if you throw away the present opportunity, such an opportunity will not come again for 100 years. Therefore, you must be prepared. I know that if after being prepared we spoke a little forcibly, some police sepoy may say 'O you (this is not unlikely). But it must be put up with. There is no help for it. We have no power in our hands. We can not say to the police sepoy, 'you are a fool, go back.' He obeys the Police Inspector's order. But I can tell you that if you people of all castes and religions, become united and at this time make this demand of Government resolutely and unitedly press (it) earnestly, be prepared to bear any expense that may be necessary for this, (and) proclaim not only to Government but to the whole world that unless your demand be granted you would not be satisfied nor remain contented,—if you possess so much resoluteness I am sure that by the grace of God you will not fail to have the demand granted to you pretty soon. This will be (lit. is) the fruit of your resoluteness. Whether in religion or in politics, resoluteness is required and that resoluteness of mind does not come without courage. It will not do to say 'How will it be? Whether good or evil may result, we want this very thing. We will ask for this very thing. For this we will collect money and undergo any expenditure or exertions that may be necessary and we will not stop this agitation till this—our demand is fulfilled. If this work is not completed within our life-time, our children also will keep

up this same agitation. When there is such devotion for this work, only then fruit will be (lit. is) obtained. Without devotion, no fruit is obtained from God, from King, in this world or in the next world. If you do not possess this devotion, no fruit will be obtained though strenuous exertions be made in this manner. First, devotion is required. Both rich and poor must possess devotion. The poor must help in their own way, the rich must help in their own way. Those who possess intelligence must help by means of intelligence. Every man must bear this thing constantly in mind. If you do not bear this (lit, such) thing constantly in mind, if you do not prepare yourself to make exertions, then it will be sheer folly to blame others for failure. Perhaps the word folly may have been disliked, (by you) I uttered it in the heat (of speaking). But my firm belief is that we have not yet begun to make efforts as strenuously, as earnestly and as devotedly, as we should have. If a Saheb were to ask (lit. tell) whether there would be confusion or not if powers were given to us, we say yes, yes. We have no men ! The men are not prepared ! And then we laugh at the Saheb in our house ; we must laugh there (cheers) (laughter.)* It will not do to laugh in our house. The reply must be given just to his face. We must be prepared to maintain the things which we consider to be true and tell them to the people, to the officers, and even to the Emperor. On the day on which you will be ready (to do this)—particularly in these days after the war is over—the administration shall have

* These words occur in English in the original.

to be changed in some respects at least. If the administration be like the present, England cannot grant any authority among European nations.* At present England is the most powerful of all. The English Government is the most powerful, but to keep it so, change must necessarily be made in the present administration. As a matter of fact they say, 'make that change,' India does not say that the change should be made. Some defects or others are found therein. I stand up to-day ; another will stand to morrow and say that your good does not lie in this. The arrangement which exists at present is itself good. There is the benign Government. The bureaucracy is wise. *Therefore if you act in accordance with their principles, that would be well. This is not the condition of traders (lit. this condition does not apply to traders). This is not the condition of intelligent people. This is not the condition of people of any religion such as Musalmans, etc. It is not the case that it applies only to one class, only to Muhammadan merchants. The thing which I am going to tell is not fo Musalmans, for Hindus, nor for traders. It applies to all. There is only one medicine for all people. That medicine is power ; take (it) in your possession, when it comes into your possession, if there be any disputes between you and us, we would be able to settle them. After the power has come into our hands there would be much time to settle them. If there be any difference of opinion in religious beliefs, that too we will remove. We want power for this. We want power to settle disputes.

* This sentence is not clear in the original.

It is not wanted for increasing them. Aliens do not know as much as we do what we have to do for our country. Their point of view is different. Hence, British Government being maintained at the head, one and the same Emperor will rule over India as he does over the British Empire. But introduce here an arrangement similar to that in other Colonies. There in those Colonies, they have got in their own hands all the power, the right of ownership, (and) the power to make laws*. That does not affect the Emperor. There is no attempt to overthrow the British Government. But this is an attempt to make the British rule more pleasing to the people. Some people will lose their means of maintenance, that is not denied. We do not think that the Emperor has reserved India for those people. The present arrangement has come into existence for some reason. It must go away. The Emperor ought to give powers into the hands of the people, and without making any distinction between Indian and British subjects, between the white and the black subjects†. As they are the Emperor's subjects, so are we too his subjects. We must become as happy as they. The thing which some wise, learned and thoughtful people have now decided to be the key of all these, is *swarajya*. The time for it has now arrived. I have explained to you the meaning of it. I have told you how its time has come. But though all (things) may exist, your resoluteness is the final thing. The opportunity, (lit. time) which has come, will be lost. Though the arrangement of which I speak be in contemplation, you

* This sentence is incomplete in the original.

† This sentence is incomplete in the original.

will not get. There must be resoluteness on your part. Fortunately the thing, about its acquisition is that an agitation of this kind has now begun. Recently we have established at Belgaum an institution to work for *swarajya.* An institution has been established in Madras. This subject is already before the Connress and it will dispose of it one way or the other. But though the several provinces make their arrangement and render help to them.* At least (you) must show so much courage that if some one the Collector Commissioner ; etc. were to ask 'what do you want' ? (he should be told) 'We want power, there must be power in our hands'. Government servants should be considered to be peoples' servants. Do not think that when in future power comes into your hands, you are not to entertain Europeans as servants. If he can work well, we shall keep him, and we shall pay him what we may think proper. But he must be our servant, we are not his servants. If we entertain this desire and make efforts for it, then this is capable of accomplishment. For this give the help that may be required. Be prepared to render such assistance as may be required to those who may come to speak to us in connection with this. And when you are thus prepared—people of different places, not only of Bombay, Poona*, Nagar, but also of Bengal, Madras etc.—if people of all places be prepared, this thing is feasible. To accomplish it, to accomplish it soon, begin to work for it. Having told this much to you, and expressing hope that the time for India to see soon some fruit or other in accordance

* Not clear in the original.

with the above will arrive, and asking your forgiveness for any mistakes I may have committed in my lecture or for my taunting words that I may have uttered respecting you, I thank you heartily [cheers].†

Lok. Tilak's Second Speech at Ahmednagar.

1st June 1916.

Place : Old Cloth Market, Nagar.

Time : 9—15 P. M.

Mr. Chaukar requested Mr. Tilak to deliver his lecture (cheers).

Lok. Bal Gangadhar Tilak said:—(A shout of 'Tilak Maharaj-ki jaya') "I had thought that I would probably not have to deliver another lecture after the one delivered here yesterday. On that occasion I have already told as many of the two or four common things about *swarajya* as could be told within an hour. But this subject is such a one that, not only one, but even ten lectures on it will not suffice. Therefore I am to-day going to speak again about two more things about *swarajya* which were not told yesterday, in such a way that the very same subject would be made more clear, would be better understood and the peoples' ideas (about it) would be more distinct. My general opinion is that what reforms we want are reforms relating to *swarajya*. You may perhaps know the story (lit. maxim) about the old woman. It is to the following effect: That old womon,

The words is in the original.

after the deity had been propitiated, considered as to what she should ask, and prayed for the following boon: The deity should give me such a boon that I would actually see my grandsons dining in dishes of gold, that is to say she should remain alive till that time, that she should have a son, that he should earn wealth, etc. ect. In this small boon the whole object is included. Similar is the case of *swarajya.* If we do not get *swarajya,* there will be no industrial progress, if we do not get *swarajya,* there will be no possibility of having any kind of education, useful to the nation, either primary or higher. If we do not get *swarajya,* it will not be merely to advance female education or secure industrial reform or social reform. All these are parts of *swarajya.* Power is wanted first. Where there is power there is wisdom. Wisdom is not separate from power. If it be, it becomes useless. In no nation this proposition is required to be made particularly clear. But it is required to be explained in a particular manner to our people. The reason of this is that there is no *swarajya* in our country. Some people raise this objection against our party : Why do you not effect social reform ? This is said not by us but by those who do not mean to give rights of *swarajya* to us, but wish to transfer the train of our agitation from one track to another. There are many people who have effected social reform among themselves. Social reform is thoroughly introduced in Burma. There is one religion. There the people are prepared for anything. Their children marry any one they like. But that country is wholly immersed in a state of dependence. There is no spirit of nationality in respect of anything there. Then,

what is wanted ? We are one nation. We have a duty to perform in this world. We must get the rights which belong to man by nature, we want freedom. We must have in our hands the right of carrying on our affairs. If you do not get these things, no reform would be fruitful for you. That is the root of all reforms. No power no wisdom. Mere book-learning is useless. If you believe that the people who have come to rule over us are superior to us in intelligence and learning, such is not my own belief. We can show as much learning, as much courage, as much ability as they. Perhaps they may not be apparent now, but they are in us. There are conjunctions in history as well as in astronomy. When the Muhammadan rule was declining, the Marathas had only recently risen. Afterwards, the English having set foot in this India, the whole power has passed into their possession, and their power is the cause of the admiration which we feel for them and the pride—be it true or false—which we feel for their ability. And when even a small portion at least of this power comes into your hands, then your wisdom will be of any use. Many things are now wanted by us. Our industries must be improved. But why was it stopped ? Who stopped it ? If we begin to look out for the cause of this, (it will appear that) we did not stop this industrial reform, we did not stop this economic reform. In that nation, in which there is a way and there is liberty to rise and to show one's ability, good qualities flourish. If you possess wisdom, when you assist some great officer and he commends you, then you think that you possess ability. This is a sort of feeble-mindedness—want of spirit—and

it has enveloped the whole nation. You say 'I cannot do it.' You never did it, no one gave you *sanad*: even before it you make an outcry that you cannot do such and such a thing. Saying so they take to some other path. In my opinion it is a great misfortune that, in our Maharashtra at least, some people should bring forward this excuse in the above manner and come in the way of the agitation which is carried on for the acquisition of the rights of *swarajya*. Have we not done these things ? Think of this, Maharashtra certainly possesses a quality that can be utilised for the nation. But at the present time we do not get an opportunity of making use of that quality, and our mind does not turn to some other thing, such as female-education or this or that thing, (simply) because that opportunity is not given to us (cheers). If any one else sees any danger in this he may do it, but my mind cannot be convinced, has not been convinced, nor do I think that it will be convinced during the few years that are left (cheers). It is vain to speak of other subjects. At present our people are not endowed with heroism, courage and learning, when our women are educated their generation will become of that sort, but even that is to arise from our own seed (cheers). If any one has such a belief (as the above) that is wrong. I do not say that female-education is not wanted but when they tell us to turn to it, in order to stop this agitation on this side then we say this is a remedy to kill the nation. If you do not possess strength, if you have no pluck to acquire anything, it is quite foolish to take an educated wife and say that the issue begotten of her would be of the above sort and that those our sons would

make some exertions in order to discharge the obligation (under which they would be to us) (cheers). You must stand on your own legs. You must bring about these things. And you must first bring about the chief of those things. The experience of those who have made exertions for the past fifty years is that this *swarajya* is the key to all (things). And if this does not come into your hands,* then (if you say) 'We shall effect this reform after making exertions (for) minor (reforms).' If you mean to effect (it thus) do so, I have no objection (to it.) Bnt that will not be helpful to this (*swarajya*). † is not helpful to this course. And I am to speak again to-day on the same subject on which I spoke yesterday in accordance with the same opinion. Yesterday I told (you) ' what *swarajya* means. By *swarajya* it is not meant that the English should be driven away. It does not matter whoever may be the king. We have nothing to do with the king. When we get our rights, that is suffieicnt. And whoever might be the king over (us), those rights can be obtained. There is a king in England. But have the English people rights or not? The King of England is himself an Emperor. Hence, if, while his kingly position is maintained in England, the English people obtain rights of freedom, then what difficulty is there in our obtaining the rights of British citizenship, the same King continuing to be Emperor in India? No difficulty of any sort remains. This dark imputation which is made, viz. that the agitation about Home Rule

---

* Not clear in the original; the sentence is left incomplete.

† These brackets are in the original.

—swarajya—is seditious and in the belief of which as sedition a security of 2,000 rupees was taken from Mrs. Annie Bssant the other day—this imputation, this accusation, does not come from the Emperor or from the subjects, but from the intervening granary-keepers (cheers). The duty which you have to do is that this administration must be changed. The King need not be changed. Unless the system—the arrangement—according to which the present administration is carried on is changed,every man in India will become more and more effeminate. The duty which we have to perform is that.* Some people say,'what does it matter if there is slavery? It is not that (they) at least give to eat? (They) do not (starve) any one to death.‡ Even the beast and birds get to eat. To get to eat is not the aim of man. To feed the family is not the end of man. 'Even a crow lives and eats offerings.' A crow maintains himself. They have not to rise crops. They get every day cooked rice to eat. I do not consider it manliness merely to maintain oneself and fill the belly, to obey the commands of the king after accepting those posts which may be kept open within the limits laid down by him (and) to maintain oneself according to his direction. This nature is common to beasts and men. If there is required the quality of manhood in man, then it must be seen whether there is any scope open for our intellect, our ability, our courage and boldness. Such scope is not open for India. Therefore. if we have

* This sentence is incomplete in the original.

‡ The word may also mean kill, beat.

any duty (to perform) then the first duty is, take a portion of this authority into your possession, it does not matter if you take a little portion of it; as the President (Mr. N. C. Kelkar, President of the Nugar District Conference) has said briefly, if we do not entertain the hope of being free to act (in matters of) spending our own money, deciding according to our own understanding according to the consent of five or ten men as to what purpose the tax which we pay is to be applied. then, according to the law of nature this kind of hope or thought which is in the minds of men will gradually lessen and to that extent we shall more and more descend to the level of beasts. *Swarajya, swarajya,* what does it mean? And what will be the (effect) of it? Does *swarajya* mean that one Collector removed and yours has come? If the native Collector remain and the English Collectors come, we want them.* There is no objection to say, remove such and such a man (and) make such and such an arrangement in such and such a place. Perhaps, a white man when paid will be a servant of us too; if he be good we shall also keep him. The question is not at all about individuals. The question is about the nation. The chief question is whether a certain nation is to be treated like beasts or considering the people in the nation to be men, their sentiment, their desire for liberty is to be bent in some [direction] (and) they are to be brought and placed in the rank of civilized nations. And (if the matter) be considered from such a standpoint, then there is no other way (to

* This sentence is not clear in the original.

accomplish this) than (the acquisition of) *Swarajya*, than the possession of authority. When that authority will once come into our hands then we shall be able to do thousands of things. Such a great attempt was made at Poona (to close) a liquor shop of Ghoda.—which may be bringing a revenue of a thousand or two to Government. But it is not under our control to close it. Why is so much correspondence* (required) to (decide) that a liquor shop should be started at a certain place or should not be started (there) ? I think that the annual profit of the shop may not be equal to [the price of the] paper that may have been used in connection with all this business (laughter† hear hear). This business which goes on in the present system should be put a stop to, this high-handedness should be ended and the authority should come into our hands. By the authority coming into our hands the hereditary qualities which we possess will be heightened. We shall find a way to make a use of those qualities in some way or other. That (is) *swarajya*. *Swarajya*, is nothing else' What if it be to a small extent ? It does not trouble you. It does not trouble you as much as it should. (If it be said), one sits at home, does some business or other, gets some money maintains his children,—this much will suffice,, wherefore should there now be the movement for *swarajya*? The only answer to this is the one idea in respect to the nation, viz., that there is in this world something more than ourselves, that there is one more duty of bringing about the good of a greater number then yourself—this

*. The word is in English in the original.

† In English.

duty you have begun to forget. There was a time when in this country, among the succession (of great men) in the Maharashtra there were able men who were awake to ideals. But owing to fate, this human nature has not remained. If another man begins to do our work, we say good. When the work is done, that is sufficient. But the discrimination where to say good and where not has left us. The English people carry on our administration, you are sitting quietly. If there be any dirt in the cattleshed they sweep it away, look to sanitation, feed them and water them at the proper time,—but have the cattle put the question that this management should come in their hands ? (Laughter). The difference between the men and cattle is that the Collector of Nagar looks to sanitation, tells what should be done if a disease comes, makes arrangement if a famine comes, takes measures that no calamity may befall you. That is to say your condition has become like that of a parrot kept in a cage; such a condition is not wanted ; the cause of this is not merely that they make things go, but that owing to that arrangement all the (good) qualities possessed by us are gradually disappearing. In order that those (qualities), may not disappear, we must be at liberty to do what they do; other things (lit. subjects) than those done by them are not to be found out; (we) are not to leave (alone) what they do and do any other thing we may like. The same (thing) is wanted. We want the same power to be in our hands. There is only one objection to this. Buf it is very bad that such a condition should arrive. A story was published in the *Kesari* ; Rabindranath Tagore has given in his autobio-

graphy a poem of this sort about a parrot kept in a cage. It narrates in full a conversation between a parrot kept in a cage and a free parrot. The free parrot said to the parrot in the cage: "There is such fun outside; one can roam so much, go any where one likes, can eat at any time one likes. Have you got such joy ? " The parrot kept in the cage replied: "Sir, what you say is true. But where can this golden perch be obtained after going out" ? Our condition has become like that. If *swarajya* be got, how are we to manage it ? No one gives, no one takes. Your anxiety is if *swaraja* be got how are we to manage it ? We are not fit. If the said parrot went out, how was he to get the cage and the perch to sit on etc. We have reached just the same condition. This condition is not natural. It is artificial. Just as that sentiment arose in that parrot's mind owing to his being confined in a cage for many years so also the above sentiment arose in our mind owing to the above powers having passed out of our hands. This is not our original natural sentiment—the natural human sentiment. As that is not the parrot's natural sentiment, just so this is not the natural sentiment of our nation. This must be borne in mind at first. We become fit to do the work that falls to us. We are the descendents of those people who were fit in this manner, and if we be their true descendents, the same qualities must become manifest in us when we have that opportunity. And we must make exertions for it with the confidence that they will (become manifest). This is what I say (cheers). If heredity (lit. hereditary effect) has any value, recognise it, otherwise at least give up calling yourselves the grandsons,—great-gran-

dsons—of such and such a person. There are now many *sardars* in our country. They say that their grandfathers were *sardars* and that they also have inherited the qualities of their grandfather's blood. But in order to save the *vatan* acquired by them (the grandfathers) they serve Sahebs in any manner they choose; well I say, they began to do so because they are *sardars*. But why should you or we, who have nothing to obtain, run after them? A sort of shadow has thus been thrown over the nation and we have to get out of it. This is an eclipse. When the moon is eclipsed, alms are given for its becoming free. You are not prepared to spend even a pie to put an end to the eclipse which has overtaken you, nor are you prepared to move for it. When the moon was eclipsed the Brahmans of ancient times used at least to make *jap* (repeating passages from Vedas, etc.). Do you make any *jap* at least; Are you making exertions for this? Are you prepared to pay a few (lit. two) pice to any one for this? No, nothing. They only raise this objection. If (powers) be given to the Hindus, what are the Muhammadans to do? If the rights of *swarajya* be given to the Hindus, the Muhammadans would not get (them). As if (we)cannot afterwards duly consult our Muhammadan brethren and come to a settlement. If powers came into our hands we would exercise *zulum* over the Muhammedans, and if the powers pass into their hands they would exercise *zulum* over the Hindus! These (men) come to tell you these things on the people's behalf. Who are they? Why do they tell you things? To delude you. This must be considered. These civil servants are far more

clever than you. They want to keep power in their hands. This case is like that of (the story) 'of the three rogues.'

"When you make a demand in political matters you are told 'you are effeminate.' The Muhammadans are opposed to you. ,So will they say'.* If the Muhammadans say that they have no objection, [they] point their finger at a third thing. In this manner this roguery is practised. Without being deceived by this roguery......‡ I do not say to any of you that you should do unlawful things in order to acquire these rights. There is a lawful way. But that lawful way is such that you must not listen to others at all. You must be prepared to say resolutely that you want what is yours. So long as you do not make a resolution in your mind as soon as some police officer comes [and asks you] 'Well had you gone to Mr. Tilak's lecture?' [you answer] 'Yes I went towards the end [of it] 'sat at a distance, and could not hear the whole.' [You] cannot deny, as the police, officer has seen [you] Why is there such a fear in your mind ? What is there to fear in saying that you want *swarajya* ? It is hear that the difficulty arises. When subsequently asked by the peple who had attended the lecture, he tells the truth. But when asked by the Police he says 'I did not hear it well, two or four were telling, what could be done ? Well, my opinion is not like his.' Such shuffling will not do in this matter. No goddess is propitiated by shuffling. That goddess knows what is in your mind, and

*. The brackets are in the original.

‡. The sentence is not complete in the origial.

of all these knowing goddesses, the godddess of Liberty is most particular on this point. (lit. subject). Ask what you want and they will give it. Perhaps they may say 'no' once or twice. How many times will they say 'no' ? They must be convinced that there is no shuffling in this matter. They must be convinced that there is no other course, unless effort is made.* It is the business of every goddess to frighten you until it appears that there is something in you. If we look into our *yoga* science, it (appears that) a goddess has to be won over. They begin to frighten (us). If there is success, all right. If, without yielding to fear, we do our work resolutely, the goddesses of the *yoga* science will become propitiated. This admits of proof, this is the rule. Even in political matters there is no other rule—other way. We want it, we shall secure it (*swarajya*)† and we shall not give up our exertions without getting it,—unless there be such a firm confidence in you this thing would not be obtained at all. This fear will remain behind, the Police will remain behind, the C. I. D. and Collector will remain behind, in the end that thing will be obtained. You must not be afraid of their blustering and bawling. Nay, (you) must consider that this is a definite consequence of this. There is a saying in English 'How can light be seen without going through darkness ?' To rise in the morning, the sun has to go through darkness, I tell you the belief of the common people, and not a proposition (lt. belief) of science. Without going through

---

* Not clear in the original.

† Brackets are in the original.

darkness, light cannot be obtained. Without getting out of the reach of these blasts of hot air, troubles, and people's blustering and bawling liberty cannot be obtained. Resolution is wanted. I told you what is *swarajya*. Efforts for it must be begun as much strenuously......‡ By the grace of God, the world's condition is at preset undergoing a change. To speak in the language of faith, God has become ready to render help. But though God be ready, you are not ready (laughter). God is quiet. Should a gift be sent to you from heaven ! Nobody at all sends. Even God does not send. And if He sends, it will also be of no use. For when you are afraid, what already exists may afterwards disappear. If this gift is given, how is it to be used ? That is to say, if there be any place of God. you will send it to his house. You will send it if it can be sent by post (laughter). After there is (rise of) such a sentiment, after authority of this sort which forms part of the national rights of which I have told you, comes into your hands, what will take place ? What will be the effect upon the nation? This I am going to tell to-day. I have told you what is *swarajya*, My friend, Mr. Kelkar, has already told you that *swarajya* does not mean that our authority is to be established here by driving away English. Some people will have to be driven away. (*swarajya*) is not driving away the King and taking his authority into one's hands. It means taking into the hand the subjects' rights. If it be carefully considered if England derived any benefit by keeping this

‡ The sentence is incomplete in the original.

one nation a slave, it will be seen from the condition of the whole of the world to-day that England will have some day or other to give liberty to the provinces and countries forming parts of the Empire under its control. This thing is to take place some day. It must take place. But if you do not do anything then only it will not take place. After keeping awake the whole night, you feel asleep when the thief came, such will be your condition. The time is coming. Perhaps the nature of the change occurring in the world—in other nations—will by the grace of God prove favourable to you. But (if) the time be favourable, it will be of use if you are awake. Otherwise (once) you sleep, you will sleep on. Owing to this, what will it avail even if we get the right of *swarajya* ? I will briefly give you a picture of what will happen. What happened during Peshwa's time ? We must examine history a little for it. At the time of the Peshwas the administration of Maharashtra was going on well. Elphinstone was the Saheb who brought about the fall of this rule of the Peshwas, and who became the Commissioner after its fall. That Saheb is witness to (what I say). Though the city of Poona was such a big one there took place no dacoities in it at night. The consumption of liquor was *nil*. It was altogether prohibited. The original system of *jamabandi* which was once settled by Nana Farnavis, was itself copied afterwards. Nay, the science as to how accounts are to be kept took its rise among us under the Peshwa's rule, and those very accounts are now kept. We know how to administer provinces. The C. I. D. of Nana Farnavis was so very excellent that information as to

what a certain *sardar* spoke to certain man at the time of dining used to be sent to him (cheers). The following incident is said to have happened at one time. The Bombay Government had sent ammunition to the Resident in a palanquin by way of the Khopoli Ghat. An order was issued from the Poona Daftar that the palanquin which might come on such and such a date should be stopped on the Ghat. It had the information that ammunition was to come in a palanquin. Afterwards the Resident complained "Why is our palanquin stopped ?" Thereupon he received a reply from Nana Farnavis, "You yourself think about it. We have attached the palanquin and will not let it go. The King must needs be informed what has taken place and at what place. We have done it." (So he was told). The C. I. D. is wanted. Who says no ? If the King has no information (he) will not be able to carry on the administration. We have no complaint against the C. I. D. (Our) complaint is about its method of working (eheers) (hear). That method is not under our control. He who has to carry on the administration, must have all departments. Police is wanted, C. I. D. is wanted. Revenue [Department] is wanted. Judicial [Department] is wanted. All departments are wanted. Where [then] is the difficulty ? There is dfficulty in one matter. All [the departments] must be under the control of the people—our control. The difficulty lies only in this. Several people have formed the opinion that the English are the most civilized, we too must civilize ourselves, who does not want civilization ? All reforms are wanted. During Nana Farnavis' time letters had to be sent ; now the C. I. D.

will send a wire. Means have become available. The administration is to be carried on by making use of all these. But the whole of this system of administration existed at the time of the Peshwa's rule. Consider what has taken place now after the break-up of that system. When the Peshwa's rule passed away, Nagar, Satara, Poona, which were in the possession of the Peshwa himself, came into the possession of the English. The lieutenants of the Peshwa at that time were great generals. Gaikwar [lit. Baroda], Holkar and Scindia were the chief among the *Jahagirdars* and *sardars* who commanded the army. These three survived as all of them soon joined the English Government and the Peshwa's rule was overthrown. This is the history of 1818. What is the condition of these three to-day ? What is the condition of the Baroda Sarkar? What is the condition of Holkar? What is the condition of the Scindia Sarkar ? And what is the condition of the territory or the district[s] adjoining Poona ? Think about this. These three or four districts having gone into the possession of the English Government, the whole of their administration gradually passed into the hands of a bureaucracy. The policy of this bureaucracy is not to listen at all to the people. First Gevernor, then Commissioner, then Collector, the Collector's subordinate the Assistant Collector, Mamlatdar, Aval Karkun, Fouzdar, Police sepoy—such is the arrangment of the whole of the bureaucracy from first to last. What is to be done for the people is to be done by them. Thc Government above issues order in respect of anything which it may think beneficial or harmful to the people, and according to it steps are taken below. At first

[this arrangement] was thought very good. The disorder under Bajirav's [rule] was put an end to. They said they were safe now. They saw the ghee but not the rod [laughter]. It began to be seen gradually afterwards. All authority went under the control of this bureaucracy. And the remaining people got education. [They] begun to make use of Railways. A Telegram can be sent if [some one] is to be informed whether I am coming to Nagar or not. Education was received. All these benefits were got. But all this authority went into the hands of the bureaucracy. It had passed (into their hands) to some extent at the time of the Company. And (it passed wholly into their hands by) the Government of India Act passed in 1858. It is 58 years now since that Act was passed. What has happened during these 58 years ? The officials became powerful, and possessed of authority. The people's authority became less. To such an extent that (it was said) we do not want the Kulkarni, we want all servants. Whatever hereditary rights (lit. powers) we may have possessed they too have gone. (This) did not strike [us] when the Inam Commission was appointed. That cannot be helped. They said Vinchurkar was a *jahagirdar* at that time. He was the master of the army. Some one was an officer of an army of 10,000 while some other was the officer of an army of 15,000. They were told 'You have to supply an army of 15,000, while you have to be paid 15 lakhs of rupees of which you have to spend 14 lakhs. Then, take one lakh of rupees" They consented. [The amount] can be enjoyed while sitting at home, then what ? This a great principle. Nobody said at

that time 'We lost our right [lit. authority] to keep an army, to fight for Government'; nobody thought so. [It was thought that] Government was good [aa] it gives to eat while we sit at home. What more is required? We have been reduced to such a condition owing to this state of things. In 50 or 60 years all the powers of this province have passed into the possession of the European bureaucracy. You should not understand from this that I call the European bureaucracy bad. They are very much learned. These posts are given to the best students from England. Their abilities are greater. But even if all this be admitted still [it is a fact] they have to undergo great wear and tear while working for us [and] the climate of England being cold and that of this country hot, larger pay has to be given to them. Having come for our good, will you say 'no' to them? [laughter]. All things are admitted by us. I do not also deny that they may perhaps be working a little more than we. I only say, when we are ready to do the work, when it is our work, why (give it) to others? Nor do [I] say that they do it badly. Our minds have begun to grow weak owing to restriction being placed on our work [and] against our interests. Our enthusiasm has begun to become less. Effeminacy is increasing. Therefore, we do not want this. I do not say that they are not wanted because they are not educated. They are good. They are merchants. Will you not get for your shop some agent more clever than yourself? There may be [such men]; But will you give your shop into the hands of such an [lit. that] agent and stand aside, taking such money as he will give? This is indeed a question in business.

It is a question in any matter. Such was the management of this province. What became of Baroda ? Look at the history of Baroda. There are such writings in the history of Baroda. And * what he could do there by degrees was not done here by degrees. The *gadi* of the Mahraja of Baroda had to be perpetuated. That was [lit. is] a matter of regular succession. That is a part of history. Formerly Baroda used to be managed or supervised from Poona, and the rest was done by the Kings of Baroda. It ‡ might have been done by other kings. Therefore, if you become ready now by receiving education here [you] go to Baroda and ask for service there. There are men educated in Poona and Bombay who are District Magistrates, Munsiffs, Subhas and Diwans. There are Naib Diwans [and] High Court Judges. These people are working there. They work [there] without complaint [being heard about them]. Then where is the objection to the same being done here ? If men from the districts of Poona and Satara go and conduct the administration of Baroda, what objection is there for them to carry on the very same administration in the same way in this our province? Who has taken objection ? The nation being divided into two parts, one part—the Marathi nation—went into the possession of the English on account of some historical reason, and one remained in the possession of (native) Chiefs. One part says that the people of this nation are fit to do work. In the other part the authorities

---

* Not clear in the original.

‡ Not clear in the original.

say that they are unfit and we too saying ditto to them, begin to talk like them. There are two standards, two sides. Then, what is wanted when [one talks of] *swarajya* ? Now you will see where is the objection to make the very same arrangement with regard to Poona [and] Satara as exists in Baroda ? The authority of the English Government will remain. It is also over Baroda. The Chief of Baroda is not an independent king. When the Peshwa's rule existed in Poona, the treaty of Bassein was made [in the proportion of] 10 to 6 annas in the rupee. Had the state of Poona remained they too would have been able to manage it. Satara and Nagar could have been managed by them. The same management exists in the Nizam's territory. *Swarajya* means this much : Give those rights which Native States have and which the Baroda and Scindia Sarkar have, to Poona and Satara after forming them into a State of the Central Division. One difference must, however, be made in this. Now a hereditary chief will not do for us. We shall have to elect our own President. This [is] the only difference. It is a historical puzzle or inconsistency, that the province which was the capital of the Marathas should not be given the arrangement which exists in Native States, while those provinces which were dependent on that province should have it. There is no reason for this. Why should we not become like them ? I have told you that the Gaekwar and Scindia have sent money and armies to Europe for the war. If [these districts] had been in our possession, we too would have done the same. This thing has nothing to do with [the question whether] the British Govern-

ment will go or will remain. But the only difference lies in the continuance or the disappearance of the authority of the bureaucracy, the foreign bureaucracy. This is the difference between the arrangements. There is no difference as to the sovereign authority which is at the root. I think Mr. Lawrence had formerly suggested that (in view of) the *swarajya* agitation going on, India should be divided into separate Native States, that some experts should be kept there, and only the powers with regard to making treaties with foreign powers and the management of the army and the navy should be kept in their [lit. our] hands so that the English rule may not be in danger. [I] do not say that you should not retain these powers. In the arrangement of *swarajya* these will be the higher questions of Imperial politics. England should freely retain in her hands the questions as to what kind of relation should subsist between India and other nations whether war should be made for a certain thing or not, and what policy should be followed when relations with foreign nations arise. Those who want *swarajya*, do not wish to interfere with these things. What we want is that just as we are to-day managing our own (things) in Native States, we want authority to do the same with regard to ourserves. We shall expend on such and such items the revenue which we get from taxes, we shall spend it on education, if there is less revenue from liquor we shall decide what other taxes should be imposed in lieu thereof and arrange accordingly, we shall manage trade, we shall manage all affairs, you shall not interfere in them. The people of India do not go to any other nation. Why do they not? See if you want to, whether

they join France or Germany. If there be still a doubt, one must be able to understand from the present state of things that if Indians are prepared to have connection with any particular country that nation is England (cheers). We will not be benefited by England going away and Germany coming in her place. We do not want the thing. Even if the matter be viewed from another practical point of view, England is here for 100 years. (while) Germany will be a new comer, and its energy will be fresh and hunger unsatisfied. How will that do? What is, is all right. A new king is not wanted. But give into our possession a portion of the powers by losing which our condition is being reduced to that of orphans. It is not I that alone am saying this. Mr. Lawrence has said so. [He writes that] if hereafter improvement is to be effected in India after the war, if Government intends to effect some [new arrangement, with regard to the people [lit. them], then divide India into different parts. The question of language did not enter his head, but we shall add that idea. Form one separate State each of Marathi, Telagu and Kanarese provinces. The question of vernaculars also comes in this [question of] *swarajya*. There is no question which is not dependent upon *swarajya*. Had there been general liberty. there would have been a Gujarati University, a Marathi University, an Agricultural University. But to do that does not lie in our hands. Is the question whether education should be given through vernacular such a big one, that there should arise differences with regard to it? But [our wish] does not prevail here. Do the English educate their people through

the French language ? Do Germans (do it) through the English language ? Do the Turks impart (education) through the French language ? So many examples being before our eyes, why should we write articles, columns upon columns long, upon the subject ? Why does that which these people say not take place now ? Because (we have no authority. You have not got the authority to determine what should be taught to your (lit. our) children. So many of you send (your) children to school, but do not consider what will become of them. In short, there is no question at present which is not dependent on 'swarajya'—on authority. Ranade and others have (up till) now made efforts with regard to the Fergusson College and the University. But who is to be prevailed upon ? Government ! They know what arrangement there was in their country. Why should the same not be here ? (For) imparting English education to all, the English language has to be taught for seven or eight years. Eight years is not a small (part) of life. Such (a state of things) exists nowhere (else). This arrangement does not exist in any civilized country. If inspite of this your attention is not drawn towards *swarajya*, then be sure that there is some thing wrong with your eyes (cheers). Whatever you have to say, whatever prayer you have to make to Government, let that prayer be for giving authority, and not for anything else. We want those things which are the leading ones under this rule. I have already told you that wherever we go (our path) is ultimately obstructed. The question of education is an ordinary one. There must be schools in each village. Whence is the money to be

brought by us? (We) pay taxes to Government. Do we pay them for nothing? Let us have the system prevalent in England for imparting education. There is money in the treasury; it is utilised, it is paid for other purposes; but it is not expended on those things which are necessary for us. Therefore, what I have told you lastly.........* India is a big country. Divide it if you want acccording to languages. Separate the Marathi (speaking) part and the Gujarati (speaking) part. But how are the Hindus and the Musalmans to be taught in them? I am going to speak about this also. In Canada the population consists of Frenchmen and Mohammadens.† If English statesmen could settle (the question) there would they not be able to settle how Hindus and Muhammadans should conduct themselves (here)? Thus these are excuses for not giving us these things. This you must believe firmly. If India be divided into different States in this manner:‡ The province of Bengal is separate. Instead of appointing over it a Chief from this side, I say, a European Governor may be appointed for some years. What used to happen before a president elected by the people was secured? A Governor used to go from England to Australia. He was obliged to work in the Council as he was told. Here, it is contrary (to the above). If you want any thing, a resolution is to be brouht before the Council, much preparation is to be made, figures are to be collected, he does not get even a pice. The other

* Sentence incomplete in the original.

† *Sic.*

‡ Sentence not complete in the original.

members of the Council are paid. He has to work for nothing, and at last the resolution is rejected. Though it be passed, Government can not be forced to give effect to it. It is a childish thing. (I think that he) who does not think it so possesses proportionately less patriotism (cheers.) This is like setting us to fight by throwing grains of boiled rice, without giving anything to us without* giving any power to us (lit. without our possessing any power). If any rights will be obtained from this in future, if any power will come into our hands, if (this) be given to us as a step towards the above, then it has a value, otherwise,* it has no value. What does happen ? This is the science of setting good and well-educated men to fight for two or four ghatkas'.† Hence, bear in mind what will result from *Swarajya* and what we ask. In asking for *swarajya* we ask that in the end there should be such States throughout India, that at first Englishmen coming from England and at last presidents elected by the people should be appointed in these States, and that a separate Council should be formed for (disposing of) questions relating to the whole nation. Just as there is an arrangement in Europe, America and the United States, and just as there are different small States and there is a Congress to unite them together so the Government of India should keep in their hands similar powers of the Imperial Council. There are present seven are eight different provinces ; make them twenty if you like and make such an arrangement in respect of

* Not clear in the original.

‡ Ghatka equal to 24 minutes.

those provinces as will give facilities to the people, meet with their approval and place power in their hands. This itself is what is meant by the demand for *swarajya.* The demand for *swarajya* does not mean that the Emperor should be removed. Perhaps, for this arrangement you may have to bring English officers in some places. This is admitted. But those officers will be ours, will be of the people, will remain as servants of the people, will not remain as our masters. The intelligence of our people will not alone suffice to bring about the reforms which are to be effected in India. We shall have to bring men from England or America, but those men will be responsible to us. They will not be irresponsible. Hence from one point of view, it cannot be said at all that this agitation is against Europeans. To whom would they be responsible ? To themselves or to us ? So long as this responsibility has not come to us, (so long as) their responsibility has not come under our power, it will continue to be just so ! Till then our efforts will be vain, though made in any direction ; till then, in whatever other matter we may make any movement, it will be ineffectual, and the desired object will not be accomplished. As long as a nation is not free to bring about its own good, as long as a nation has no power to make an arrangement to bring about a certain thing which it may desire, so long I do not think, your belly will be filled if you are fed by others. Now the people know, some people are convinced that the people's good cannot be effected by what is called 'despotic* rule'

* These words occur in English in the original.

in English. Hence, my object is to tell you that you should make efforts. If my words fall short of (expressing) it, that is my defect, not a defect in the idea, which is faultless. All these things, their different natures, cannot be placed before you in a single lecture. As regards this idea of States about which I spoke, there are many questions, viz., what arrangements should there be in them ? What rignts should there be in them. And what amendment should be made in the India Act of 1858 about consolidation ?† And though I may deliver not only one but four or ten lectures, they would not be sufficient to deal with those (questions.) Our principle is one—about this alone I have to speak in (this) lecture. Those of you who are competent, by virtue of intelligence, wealth or in some other manner, to consider these things, will spontaneously know that these things are wanted. Why ask, 'Will this be obtained ? Will this be obtained?' To acquire it or not lies in their hands. I do not understand this question at all. You are making so much exertion. (No matter) if it be not obtained. As for making exertions, it is in our hands. We need not consider whether we shall get it or not. Exert yourself. The work which you do will not fail to produce some result or other. Have firm belief in your mind. Have not any men obtained any freedom in the kingdom or not? Had goddesses fallen from above in other nations? I tell you plainly that if you have no courage, (it) will not be obtained. If there be courage, if it be not obtained to-day, it will be obtained

† Not clear in the original.

to morrow it will be obtained after 10 or 20 years. But you must make efforts for it. The principle of your religion is this 'You are only to work, you are not ever to look to the fruits.' Why is this said in the Gita ? Is it for going to worship, for obtaining a *sher* of rice by reciting Puran ? Great religions tell this very thing. The Western history tells this very thing. In spite of this, will you ask 'What will become of us ? How shall we fare ?' 'As made of a ball of earth, etc.' There is a ball of earth. We have it to be called Vishnu. We have it to be called Shiva. And we impart so much importance to it that it is worshipped by the people. Lo! (it is) merely a ball of earth without any movement. When dropped on the ground if falls down with a thud. We can give a form to that ball by some act, exertion (and) ceremony. Now, these our bodies which are, unlike that earthen ball, endowed with life.......* If a form of some sort cannot be given to an earthen ball, it must be said to be your fault. It is possible to give them a form. Do not make haste. Nothing will be gained by it (haste).‡ If you work resolutely, a different form can be given to an earthen ball. This thing is told in the *Shastras ?*. It is proved. It is proved by experience, proved by evidence, by history. If in spite of this testimony placed before you, you are not convinced, if you are not satisfied, at least give up talking about the country attaining a flourishing condition afresh. Do not bother our heads. These things are capable of happening—must happen.

* This sentence is not complete in the original.

‡ The brackets are in the original.

There must be such faith. That faith brings about works. Where that faith does not exists.* Whnt is to be done hen ? They do not give anything, they only say they would give—such† an opinion is not wanted. I do not say that what may be given should not be taken. Take what is given, ask for more, do not give up your demand. (Laughter.)‡ We want so many rupees. You gave one hundred. 'Take one hundred from another,—why should¶ you have such an opinion ? If even (some) out of hundred be not offered, what have you now to say against them ?¶ (Laughter.) We want one thousand. When we get a thousand rupees, we shall be satisfied. If 1/10 of a hundred be given we shall thank (you) (laughter). Not that we shall not thank (you). This is human nature. If my paper falls down, I shall say 'thank you' when you give it to me. This is human feeling. I do not tell (you) to give it up. But the humanness of man lies in securing those aspirations which are included in this feeling. All these other feelings must be treated§ as servants of that feeling, that exertion, that one goal. When this is done *swarajya* will be obtained. *Swarajya* is not a fruit (so) that it may at once fall into the mouth from the sky. Another man is required to put it into the mouth. This is such|| a

* Not clear in the original.

Not clear in the original.

Not clear in the original.

Not clear in the original.

|| Not clear in the original.

...¶¶ These four lines are not clear in the original.

work. And for it this beginning is made. The paper which my friend Tatya Saheb has now given into my hand is of such a sort. The work has been begun a little in India. Mrs. Annie Besant has established a Home Rule League at Madras. Here also we have established one. And in the same manner a Home Rule League will soon be established in Bengal or elsewhere. If, perhaps the Congress will take up this question and itself establish a league, the other leagues will be merged into it. The same work is to be done. This work is one and you are to do (it). This is a question of (securing) benefit. We have to obtain *swarajya*, I have told you what sort of *swarajya* is to be obtained. I told you what change it will hereafter produce in the present condition. The House of Lords have begun to have such dreams. Lord Hardinge said that the Civilians will soon have to place in your hands the rights belonging to you. The people belonging to the party opposed to you in this matter have begun to have bad dreams (laughter). While you alone (say) 'We are unfit, we shall not take this.' Whence (does) this obstinancy (arise) ? (Laughter.) What is the rationale of this ? (It is that) they have begun to have such dreams. They think that some or other arrangement of this sort will have to be made. The work you have to do first (is this) : You must make agitation in the whole country and convince every man that this alone is our goal. For this we have to work. Nay, we must settle what is it we want, what arrangement should there be—this demand must be settled. We must go to England and convince the people of it. And when this subject will be discussed in Parliament this

subject must be placed before it in a proper manner. That 'proper manner' means that a bill to amend the existing India Act must be brought before Parliament. What we have to demand is this : Amend this Act for us. When the East India Company was abolished and the rule of the Queen's government came, this Act was amended i. e., minor amendments were made in it. We want to have it amended in a certain manner. And this is wanted not merely for our good but for the good of the Empire. To make such a demand of them is a part (lit. business) of that work. This work must be done with the help and acquiescence of all. There must be left no difference of opinion about this. The moderates and the Nationalistes have one and the same goal, one and the same demand is to be made and one and the same (thing) is to be obtained. For doing this work which is to be carried on by entertaining this sentiment, a separate institution called the Home Rule League is established. This subject is placed before the Congress. But as the Congress is to assemble once a year, when once an opportunity is gone, (another comes) in the next year. But we have to do this work throughout the year. This is admitted by the Congress. With this object we have established this League. Not very great exertion is required for this. Recognize this goal. We have a right to demand (the fulfilment of) this goal. The demand for money made to-day is only this ; Every man should pay one rupee. The admission fee is Rs. 2. But if this is not to be paid, pay at least one rupee. If one *lakh* out of thirty crores of people be not found (willing to pay,) then at least cease to prate about India. Do not

tire our ears. I do not think that more than a year will be required for this agitation to become successful. The subscription for one year is fixed at Re. I. It is not necessary to carry on the agitation for 10 or 20 years, Such a time has come. Hence if you are not disposed to make the self-sacrifice of taking one rupee out of your pocket for this agitation then at least do not come to the lecture, so that it may not be necessary to talk so loudly. If you have do to anything it is only this. The people belonging to this institution are prepared to make the remaining arrangement. For this purpose many lectures like this will have to be delivered in various places. People will have to be got together. (The matter) will have to be explained to the people. If the police come to stop (the proceedings), if it is not [allowed] here, we must go elsewhere and assemble. We must go there before the police go. We must persist. Do not think that this can be obtained easily and pleasantly. One rupee is nothing. There must be resolution of the mind. If any one comes to ask, you must plainly tell him; The goal we demand is lawful. We have become its members and paid one rupee. We want that thing. You must say this fearlessly. If you have not the courage to say this that is a different thing. I trust that this thing will be considered good by the whole of India, perhaps by your descendants if not by you. Though you may not have he will, this thing must be done. If not you the people of the next generation will make efforts, but they will call you asses. If you mean to put up with this, then I have no objection. My own conviction is that it will be

obtained. Bear in mind what work you have to do and what help you have to give. Perhaps there will be trouble from the police, this is not denied. (If they ask) 'Well, have you become subscribers ? Have you become members ?' You must say 'Yes, we have become.' Such is the law, nothing else wiil happen. If a prosecution be instituted, the pleaders in this (institution) will conduct the (defence) without taking any fee (laughter). If a rupee be paid for this work, that would not be sedition. More than this (*i. e.* paying Re. I and becoming a member)* you have not to do: This League undertakes to do the remaining work. [Strange] that the people of Maharashtra should remain quiet at such a time !" We want all, whether they be Muhammadans, Hindus [or] Marwaris. Among these there are none who are not wanted; in this there is no distinction of caste or religion. This work is to be done for India. I have already stated on a former occasion at a certain place, that there is a [practice] amongst you traders that they keep one anna [in the rupee] out of profits for cow protection. Such is your habit. I ask, 'Why sould not the traders give to us a pice or half pice in the anna for this [object] also ?' India is a great cow, not a small one. That cow has given you birth. You are maintaining yourselves on that cow's industry, on her fruitfulness, [and by] drinking her milk. [You] forget that cow, but [lit. and] on seing the accounts one anna, one anna [is seen] debited in her name. [For cow-prote-

---

0 The brackets are in the original.

ction.]* For what is the anna taken out? For giving fodder to the cow, for rescuing her from the hands of the butcher. We are dying here to-day without work. But does the idea ever occur to you that this is a cow for you ? That idea never occurs to you. This is a work for the protection of religion, and for the protection of cows. This is the work of the nation and of political progress. This [work] is of religion, of progress. [I ask you] to take into consideration all this and to assist us as much as lies in your power. I have already said we do not ask for more than one rupee per man. He who has the ability should obtain the merit of protecting the cow by paying this one rupee at least once to this institution. This is a great work. If sons of the cow will not care [about] this then you shall have to be called bullocks, as the sons of cows are called [laughter]. You shall have to be given that name which is commonly applied to cow's sons. I have told you these things. This institution has been started. Work has commenced. If perils overtake it we are prepared to bear them. They must be borne. It will not do at all to sit idle. All will be able to support themselves. Therefore assist in this manner this undertaking. Then God will not abandon you : such is my conviction. These things will be achieved by the grace of God. But we must work. There is a very old principle that God helps them who help themselves.‡ This principle occurs in the Rigveda. God becomes incarnate. When ? When you take complaints to Him and pray to Him. God does not become

* The brackets are in the original.

‡ This is quoted in English in the original.

incarnate for nothing. God does not become incarnate for idle people. He becomes incarnate for industrious people. Therefore begin work. This is not the occasion to tell all the people to-day what sort of amendment is to be effected in the law. It is difficult to discuss every such thing at such a large meeting. Hence put together the few general things which I told you [now] and those which I told yesterday, and set about to work. And at last having prayed to God to make your efforts successful I conclude my speech [cheers]. [Victory to Tilak Maharaj from the audience.]

Lok. TILAK'S SPEECH.

[DELIVERED AT THE 31st INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS].

Lok: Bal Gangadhar Tilak, who on rising to support the resolution, was given a great ovation, said :—

Mr. President, brother delegates, ladies and gentlemen,—I thank you sincerely for the reception that you have given me on this platform ; but let me tell you that I am not a fool enough to think that this reception is given to my person. It is given, if I rightly understand, for those principles for which I have been fighting [Hear, hear]. The resolution which I wish to support embodies all those principles. It is the resolution on self-government. It is that for which we have been fighting, the Congress has been fighting for the last 30 years. The first note of it was heared ten years ago on the banks of the Hooghly and it was sounded by the Grand Old Man of India—I mean the patriot, Parsi gentlemen of Bombay, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. [Appla-

use.] Since that note was sounded a difference of opinion arose. Some said that that note ought to be carried on and ought to be followed by a detailed scheme at once, and that it should be taken up and made to resound all over India as soon as possible. There was the other party amongst us that said that it could not be done soon and that the tune of that note required to be a little lowered. That was the cause of dissension ten years ago. But I am glad to say that I have lived these ten years to see that we reunite on this platform and that we are going to put forward our voice and shoulders to push on this scheme of self-government. We have lived—there is a further thing—not only have we lived to see these differences closed but to see the differences of the Hindus and Mahomedans closed as well. So we are united in every way in the United Provinces and we have found that luck in Lucknow. [Laughter.] So I consider it the most auspicious day, the most auspicious in the most auspicious session of the 31st Indian National Congress. And there are only one or two points on which I wish to address you.

It has been said, gentlemen, by some that we Hindus have yielded too much to our Mahomedan brethren. I am sure I represent the sense of the Hindu community all over India when I say that we could not have yielded too much. I would not care if the rights of self-government are granted to the Mahomedan community only. [Hear, hear]. I would not care if they are granted to the Rajputs. I would not care if they are granted to the lower and the lowest classes of the Hindu population provided the British Government considers them more fit

than the educated classes of India for exercising those rights. I would not care of those rights are granted to any section of the Indian community. Then the fight will be between them and the other sections of the community and not as at present a triangular fight.

We have to get these rights from a powerful Bureaucracy, an unwilling Bureaucracy! Naturally unwilling because the Bureaucracy will feel that those rights, that authority, will pass out of their hands. I would feel the same thing and I am not going to blame the Bureaucracy for entertaining that natural feeling. But whatever the character of that feeling may be it is a feeling which we have to combat against; it is a feeling that is not conducive to the growth of self-government in this country. We have to fight against that feeling and when we have to fight against a third party it is a very great thing, a very important event, that we stand on this platform united in race, united in religion, united as regards all different shades of political creed. That is the most important event of the day.

Let us glance, as I said, ten years ago when Mr. Dadabhai Naoraji declared that Swarajya should be our goal. The father has christened it has baptised it with the name of Swarajya. Later on it came to be known as self-government or constitutional reform; and we Nationalists style it Home Rule. It is all the same — one in three different names. It is said that as there is objection raised that Swaraj has a bad odour in India and Home Rule has a bad odour in England we ought to call it constitutional reform. I don't care to call it as any reform. If you style it as A. B. C. reform scheme

or X. Y. Z. reform scheme I am equally content; I don't mind for the name, but I believe we have hardly realized the importance and character of that scheme of reform. Let me tell you that it is far more liberal than the Irish Home rule Bill and then you can understand what possibilities it carries with it. It will not be complete Home Rule but more than a beginning of it. It may not be complete self-government but it is far better than local self-government. [Laughter.] It may not be Swaraj in the widest sense of the word but it is far better than Swadeshi and boycott. It is in fact a synthesis of all the Congress resolutions passed during the last 30 years,—a synthesis that will help us on to proceed to work in a definite, in a certain responsible manner. We cannot now afford to spend our energy on all 30 resolutions—public service resolutions, Arms Act and sundry others. All that is included in this one resolution of self-government and I would I ask everyone of you to try to carry out this one resolution with all your effort, might and enthusiasm, and everything that you can command. Your intelligence, your money, your enthusiasm, all that you can command must now be devoted for carrying out the scheme of reform. Don't think it is an easy task. Nothing can be gained by passing a resolution on this platform. Nothing can be gained by simple union of the two races. Hindus and Mohomedans and the two parties Moderates and Nationalist. The union is intended to create a certain power and energy amongst us and unless that energy and power are exercised to the utmost you cannot hope to succeed. So great are the obstacles in your way. You must now be

prepared to fight out your scheme in short. I don't care if the sessions of the Congress are not held any longer. I think it has done its work as a deliberative body. The next part is executive and I hope I shall be able to place before you later the executive part of the scheme. It is only the deliberative part that has been placed before you. Remember what has been done. It is not the time for speaking. When Swaraj was declared as our goal it was questioned whether it was legal and the Calcutta High Court has declared that it was. Then it was said that Swaraj was legal but it must be expressed in such words as not to amount to criticism of the Bureaucracy. That too has been judicially decided.—You can criticize, you can make any criticism in order to further your object, in order to justify your demand, perfectly within the bounds of law. So the goal has been declared legal. Here you have a specific scheme of Swaraj passed by the united India. All the thorns in our way have been removed. It will be your fault if you now do not obtain what is now described in it. Remember that. But I ask you it is very serious responsibility. Don't shirk it. Work. I say the days of wonders are gone. You cannot now feed hundreds of people on a few crumbs of bread as Jesus did. The attainment of this object cannot be achieved by a wonder from heaven. You have to do it. These are days of work, incessant labour, and I hope that with the help of Providence you will find that energy, that enthusiasm and those resources which are required for carrying out this scheme within the next two years to come. If not by the end of 1917, when I expect the war will be closed, during at least 1918 we

shall meet at some place in India where we shall be able to raise up the banner of self-rule. (Loud applause.)

HOME RULE FOR INDIA.

LOK. TILAK'S LECTURE DELIVERED AT THEOSOPHICAL PANDAL LUCKNOW.

Lok. Tilak's Right of Speech.

Mrs. Besant then called upon Mr. Tilak to speak and said: "One who had been silenced for over 6 Years for the sake of his country has a right of speech at every assembly of Indians."

LOKAMANYA TILAK.

Lok. Bal Gangadhar Tilak was received with a great ovation and cheers of Bande Mataram. He said : I did not come here to diliver an address; nor did I think that I would be asked to speak. But the subject is so fascinating and one cannot resist the tamtation of saying at least a few words. The Lucknow Sessions has become the most important sessions of the congress. The president of the congress said that it was the Indian National Congress. Two things have taken place.

HINDUS AND MUSLIMS

have been bronght to-gether. There is a feeling among the Hindus that too much has been given. I think the objection is not national. As a Hindu I have certainly no objection to making this concession. When a case is difficult the client goes to his vakil and promises to pay one half of the property to him if he wins the case. The same is the thing here. We cannot rise from our present intolerable condition without the aid of Muslims.

So in order to gain the desired end there is no objection to giving a percentage, a greater percentage to the Muslims. Their responsibility becomes greater, the greater percentage of representation you give them. They will be doubly bound to work for you, with a zeal and enthusiasm greater then ever. *The first* at present is

A TRIANGULAR FIGHT.

You have to wrest the Self-Government from out of the hands of a powerful bureaucracy. This body has already commenced to work in order to retain its power in its own hands. It is but natural. You would do the same thing yourself if you were in power. Possession is nine points of law. Bureaucracy is in possession of power and why should they part with it? Right cannot be obtained by yearly resolutions. There are difficulties in the way of carrying out these resolutions, but these difficulties must strengthen us in our beliefs and in our actions.

GOOD DONE BY BUREAUCRACY.

Bureancracy too has done some good in over country. They have tried to clear India of the Jungle that was there. But further on, after clearing the Jungle, there is *one thing* they do. They do not want to sow in the ground thus cleared. We want to utilise it for agriculture. India has united into one mass under this bureaucracy, now it is expected to rise to the call of duty. The next point naturally arises. *We* now want liberty. *Similarly*, we educate our children and expect them to take our position later on in life. So is the case with Englishmen. They have united us. They have educated us and they must expect us to take the

position we are fit for. History and reasons are against the difficulties *Created* by the bureaucracy and we must triumph in the end. The only thing that comes in our way is that we are not yet prepared. No shilly-shalling will do. Be prepared to say that you are a Home Ruler. Say that you must have it and I dare say when you are ready you will get it. There is nothing anarchical in this demand. Are you prepared to work for it?

Home Rule is an extensive subject. A strong resolution has been passed by the congress and now the education of the masses lies in your hands. Home Rule is the synthesis of all congress resolutions. Home Rule is the only remedy. Insist on your rights. India is your own house. Is is not? (Cries of yes) Then why not manage yourself? (Cheers). Our domestic affairs must be in our own hands. We do not want separation from England.

VEDANTA'S SUPPORT.

There is a saying in our Vedants meaning that if a man tries he can become God himself. If that is so, do you mean to say that you cannot become bureaucrats if you want to? It is very obvious. Have firm faith in the brighter prospects of humanity or, as they are called, in the laws of evolution. Then I believe, by that faith you will be able to realise your object within a year or two. (Cheers)

11th January 17 New India.

HOME RULE.

LOK. TILAK'S LECTURE DELIVERED AT CAWNPORE ON JANUARY 1ST 1917.

Gentlemen,—It is extremely unfortunate that I am not addressing you in your mother tongue Hindi which claims to be the *lingua franca* of India; I am sorry for it the more when I see the large crowd that has assembled here to welcome me on this occasion. I am sorry because I am one of those who hold that Hindi should be the *lingua franca* of India in future. But unfortunately, not being able to speak in Hindi I have thought it fit to address you in English on this occasion, a few words which relate to a subject in which all of us were engaged at Lucknow. Gentlemen, you must have all probably heard that the Lucknow Congress was a memorable Congress, a momentous step being taken therein as regards Home Rule. You will be able to learn that after 30 years of deliberation we have at last come to the conclusion that nothing will save us except Home Rule. As I have said in the Congress it is a synthesis of all the resolutions hitherto passed by the Congress during the last 30 years. Whatever side you may look at the question from, you will be convinced that the freedom which Home Rule implies is necessary for the regeneration of this country. Everything in the moral, material or intellectual sphere of this nation depends upon the freedom which at present we are deprived of. You cannot do anything which in your opinion is calculated to raise your status to that of a civilized nation according to the modern standard. It

has been pointed out by more eloquent speakers than myself and men who are entitled to your respect and veneration far more than I am. I say it has been pointed out to me several times that unless we get a part of the freedom for which we are trying, for a part of the power which rests in the hands of the bureaucracy at present, it is impossible for us to attain that position to which we are entitled as a birthright. If you see what is your position at present, if you look around, you will see that you are crippled in every respect. Whether you take the question of industry, whether you take the question of education, or any other question, everywhere there is a stumbling block in your way, so that you have not the power to carry out what you wish. We must be prepared to face this one important question before we can hope to make any progress—progress that is worth the name. Many of the objection to the attainment of Home Rule have already been answered in the Congress and out of the Congress. I would only take one or two of them because I am afraid that speaking in English I shall not be understood by this large audience and secondly because the time at our command is very short. You who are assembled here to listen to me and to do honour to me will, I think, agree that in honouring me you are honouring the cause of Home Rule. The very fact of your presence here to hear a speaker who has devoted some time to this question shows that you are all interested in that important question. They say that there is no public opinion in India in favour of Home Rule. This is a proposition which if our opponents were here will find contradicted

by the presence of you all. I do not think that you have come here to respect my person but I think you have come here to respect the cause of Home Rule; and a very large gathering like this is a splendid refutation of the objection that we are not prepared for Home Rule, that we are unable to exercise influence over the masses in this country, that we can take no interest in it and that it will take several decades of years if not hundreds of years according to our opponents to render us fit for Home Rule. This meeting is in itself, as I said, a refutation of the charges that are brought against us. Another objection that is raised is that we Hindus never enjoyed Home Rule. Nothing can be more incorrect, more erroneous and false, I may say, than a statement like this. Many of you in Nothern Indin enjoyed Home Rule in ancient days. The Hindu polity which is included in the King's duties in the Manusmriti text lays down a kind of social organization which is known as Chatur Varna. Many of you now believe that Chatur Varna consists merely of different castes that divide us at present. No one thinks of the duties belonging to these castes. A Kshattriya will not take food with the Brahmin and a Brahmin will not take food with a Vaishya and Vaishya will not take food with a Shudra. It was not so, let me point out, in the days of Manu and Bhagwatgita. Bhagwatgita expressly states that this division was not by birth but by the quality and by the profession which were necessary to maintain the whole society in those days. The Kshattriyas defended the dominion and defended the people against foreign aggression and against internal inter-

ruptions. Where are those? The whole of that class, is gone off and their duties devolve upon the British wh[illegible] have taken charage of the duties of Kshattriyas. Take again commerce. You think this is a commercial town. There are many labourers but you find that the country is exploited for the benefit not of India but of other nations. Raw products are exported and refined products are brought in to the sacrifice of several industries for which India was famous in ancient times. See the Vaishya class—that too is now being dominated by the British people or British merchants. Take the Brahmins. I am a Brahmin. We boasted that we were the intellectual heads of the community-we were the brain in fact—but that brain is now rendered so dull that we have but to import in this country foreign philosophy at the cost of our ancient learning in every department of life. What I consider is that Chatur Varna divides the whole society into so many departments of life and in every one of these departments you have been a loser every year, every decade. I want you now to recognize this fact and to try for gaining the position which we occupied in our own societies. We have been deprived of volunteering, we have been deprived of the right to the higher grades in service. The men remain, but the duties are gone and all your feeling at present is that I am a Kshattriya and yon are a Brahmin and that he is a Sudra. All have lost their titles. I am not partial to one or the other. I want you to realise the fact that although you may claim the blood of Kshatriya, although you may claim the blood of a Brahmin, you do not claim that polity, those qualifica-

tions which the Sudras are enjoying which should have been yours at this moment. Now one aspect of Home Rule is to encourage you to acquire the freedom which you enjoyed in these various departments of life and to come up to that standard by the co-operation of and under the sovereignty of the British rule. This result is not to be achieved by any unlawful and unconstitutional means, but I am sure by a desire and interest to raise your status to achieve this goal by means of the sympathy of the British people ond by remaining a permanent part of the Empire. But this part is of two Kinds. In a household, servants form part of a household and children form part of a household. We want to occupy the part of children and not of servants-not a dead part but an equal part in that greatest Empire which the world has seen. We are quite willing to remain a part but not a dead part which will be a burden to the Empire but a living member, and a living member is expected to develop all the qualities which you find in the department of social life. It is with this view, gentlemen, that the Home Rule agitation has been started to make you masters in your house and not servants. This is the real sense of that situation which every one is bound morally and intellectually to attain. Home Rule is nothing else, but to be masters of your houses. Have you ever thought of such a simple question 'what am I in my house—am I a dependent or am I master ?' And if India is your house I want to ask you, gentlemen, whether there can be any ground or reason to tell you that you ought not to be masters so far as your domestic affairs are concerned. When an Englishman has been

deprived of his rights he will not be content unless he gets back his rights. Why should you lag behind, why should you not in the name of religion, in the name of polity, in the name of that polity which was cultivated in the past to the largest extent the history of the world has yet produced—in the name of that philosphy that is religions, I appeal to you to awaken to your position and do your level best for the attainment of your birth right—I mean the right of managing your own affairs in your own home. If do not do it who will do it for you? Do not be hypnotised. You are fit for it, only you have not seen it. You can get your object by your own efforts, by yor own action, and this is the self-realization that I want you to feel. If you once realise that you are the master of your domestic affairs as other men are, as men in the colonies and as men in the other parts are, I dare say nothing can stand between you and your object to attain it. It all depends upon your efforts. In Locknow and Cawnpore yon will find better men very soon addressing you on this subject, and if I can prepare the ground for the noble workers that are to come hereafter. I shall not have spoken in vain today. It is a thing which you must look to now. Give up apathy. You are as good men as members of any other cmmunity in the world. You have hands and feet and you know what has been said in one of Shakespear's dramas. We are certainly better than a Japanee and yet Japan has attained what you seem hopeless to attain and are indifferent to aspire to get. Your fault lies not in the want of capacity or want of means but your fault lies in the want of the will. You have not cultivated that will

which you ought to have done. Will is everything. Will-power makes it as strong as you can and the material world round you cannot drive you from attaining the object which you will attain. You must make up that will and if that will is made up by every community there is a proverb in my part that the divine power resides in five persons. Instead of 5 let me now change that 5 into 500 million; and if you realise the fact that you have a certain object to get that, you must attain to a particular stage to which you are entitled as birth-right. You must say that this will so strengthened cannot resist the forces that are arrayed against you. It is the will you have not been thinking over. You do not devote to it one moment of your life, one moment during the day. A Brahmin is for instance enjoined in the Shastras to perform his prayers once in the morning and once in the evening. What is that prayer ? It is the cultivation of the will. Now let your prayer be, 'I will try to have my birth-right'. Have that prayer every morning and evening. Do not forget it during all the work or business that you do during the day. If there be temptations in your way repeat that prayer in the morning and evening. Prayer has such a power as to surmount all obstacles; that is the effect of prayer. It is no use praying merely for nothing. God does not want prayer for himself. God does not need it. God does not want any praise from you—it is all useless. Realise that fact. What is the good of praying without any object. God has created you. God knows how to conduct his own creation. Do you mean to say that by your praying you cannot change the course of

events of *karma* ? Do pray morning and evening for Home Rule and I dare say that within a year or two you can attain your object. Thanking you for your reception I close my remarks on the subject; and if any of you have not understood me because I have spoken in English then some one of the gentlemen on the platform will undertake to repeat that for you, and I ask your pardon not to have been able to address you in your own words. (Cries of Tilak Maharaj Ki-Jay.)

SWARAJYA—

(AKOLA 12th, JANUARY 1917).

It was about 8 yrs ago that I had an occasion to speak to you and I well remember what I had said then when concluding my address. The 'Rivet split' had occured two years before, and I have said that the split was not due to divergence in ideals, but to difference of opinion as to the method of work which was to be followed to gain the one common ideal of Swarajya which was held up before the eyes of the Nation by the Grand Old Man of India, Dadabhai Naoroji, in his presidential speech, as the President of the Indian National Congress. Thus the difference being one of Method and not ot ideal it would surely be forgotten as time rolled on, And the keenness of it would be lessened every year till we met again on a common platform. The events and the last Congress have gratified my prophecy. The ideal of Home Rule has passed through trials and ordeals, and stands today perfectly bindicated as both loyal and practical. It is now conclusively proved that the gain

of one is the gain of both, and in India's Self-Government lies the future stability and safety of the British Empire. Since Home Rule is an ideal bindicated in courts of Law as legal and loyal, it must be proved by arguments that India stood in immediate need of it, that India should demand it, and that the demand was justifiea by defects in the method of the working of the existing mode of Government which could not be remedied except by Self-Government and that it was also proved that we were fit for receiving and handling the rights of swarajya when they come us. In justifying swaraj and pointing out the defects of the present system of Government one had to use hard arguments and a language which—taking the subject matter into cansideration—could not be soft. And in certain quarters this was again resented. Our opponents said, "Ask for Home Rule as much as you like but you must not criticize the bureaucracy ; that creates discontent." This was asking us to achieve an impossibility. It was as if you asked man to eat a fruit without biting it. To ask you to do so is only another way of preventing you from eating the fruit. How could the demand for Home Rule be justified without showing that there were defects in the present mode of working of the Government which were incurable without Home Rule in India ? And how could these defects be shown except by irrefutable arguments which hit hard ? Luckily this question is solved by the Bombay High Court for us now, and it is now pronounced that criticizing the visible machinary of the Government is not sedition, that an angry word, a hard expression, an indiscreat phrase might have been

employed without meaning the least harm. Thus we know that the ideal of Home Rule was lagitimate and just, and critisizing mode of Government was not illegal, but the great question was yet undecided and the question was

WHAT WAS MEANT BY HOME RULE.

This is the third stage in the history of Home Rule. I am glad to tell you that the last congress given a satisfactory answer to this question. It is not a solution which party puts forward ; it is not a solution which community advances. It is a solution unanimously accepted by Hindus, Musalmans, Moderates and Nationalists alike. It means Representative Government, Government over which the people will have control. I shall tell you also

WHAT IT DOES MEAN.

It does not mean snapping as under the connection between England and India; it does not mean disclaiming the suzerain power of the King-Emperor. On the contrary it affirms and strengthens both we need the protection of England even as a matter of pure self-interest. This is the keynote to which the song of Home Rule must be tuned ; you must not forget this nor must you forget that it is the connection with England and the Education she gave that have given rise to the ambitions that fill your hearts today.

Self-Government then as I told you means Representative Government in which the wishes of the peoples will be respected and acted upon and not disregarded, as now, in the interests of a small minority of civil servants. Let there be a Viceroy and let him be an

Englishman if you like, but let him act according to the advice of the representatives of the people. Let our money be spent upon us and with our consent. Let public servants be really servants of the public and not their masters as they at present are. The question as to how many members will sit in the council is immaterial. The material question is will the greater majority of them represent the Indian public or not, and will they be able to dictate the policy of the Government or not. This then is what Home Rule really means.

A LONG AND WEARY PATH.

Now I need hardly tell you that a long and weary path lies before you. You must tread it with courage and steadily. It is difficult thing to gain and therefore worth gaining. Great things cannot be easily gained and things easily had are not great. In the Gita Lord Shri Krishna says that among the 5 causes that lead to success 'Daiva' is one. Daiva is the chance that God gives you and leaves you to profiit by it or not. Daiva is something that human effort cannot control but which comes just at the time which is most opportune and it is entirely our fault if we do not know how to take advantage of it. You have now Daiva in your favor. You must press your claims now. This is the time. If you fail to make an advance the world will march ahead and you will be left behind like the grass that grows by the road side, like the mile-stone that ever stands there.

IN REPLY TO ADDRESS OF THE YEOTMAL CITIZENS.

(YEOTMAL, 9TH JANUARY 1917).

I thank you very much for the presentation of an address to me and for the hospitable reception, you have been kind enough to accord. But let me tell you, I have not come here to receive these marks of honour and I never expected them. I have come here to do something and if possible to ask you to do it, and that something is the work to be done in connection with the attainment of 'Swaraj' or 'Home Rule.' It does not require high intelectual gifts to understand the meaning of 'Swaraj.' It is a simple sanskrit word meaning nothing more or less then the power to rule our homes, and hence it is called in short 'Home Rule.' It is your birth right to govern your own house or home ; nobody else can claim to do it, unless you are a minor or a lunatic : the power of the Court of Words as soon as 'Malik' attains majority or becomes non-lunatic ; the agent or the court, to which the power was transferred, is in duty bound to transfer the same power back to the 'Malik' or the real owner. If the court or the agent will not do it, he must bring forth evidence to justify his action. We tell the Government that we are no longer minors, nor are we lunatics, and we are able and competent to look after our affairs, our 'home' and we will rule the 'home'; we have got a right to say that we want this agent or that and we will guide the 'Home Policy', This demand for 'Home Rule' is not a new one; the Congress and other elder and younger institutions in the country

have been demanding it. Nor is the idea novel or new to us. The village panchayets, the councils of Pandits or elders to advise and guide the king or Emperor and such other kindred institutions were in existence for long. The King was not the final authority in the matter of Law ; the King himself used to consult wise men of high spiritual and moral developement, sages well versed in Shruti and Smriti, and then decide the point. King Dushyanta actually did it, when he had to accept Shakuntala and her son. The words स्वराज्य, वैराग्यं were actually seen in the Shastras. Of course, the word Swaraj or 'Home Rule has got a limited meaning to-day. The 'Swaraj of to-day is within the Empire and not independant of it. There have been lots of misrepresentations during the last two years by our opponants, and persecutions and prosecutions were the consequences. Now the meaning of Swaraj has been definitely defined by the congress at Lucknow ; there is now no room left for doubts and misrepresentations. The 'Swaraj' or 'Self-Government' as embodied in the Congress Resolution should be now openly owned and preached by every one. There is no sedition in it ; the High Courts do not find any sedition in it, Our way is now quite clear ; the difficulties have been removed. Every one of us, whether a Hindu or a Mohomedan, a moderate or a nationalist, should start with this clear perception of 'Swaraj' and fearlessly preach it, with all the enthusiasm he can commend. Our opponents say we are not fit ; but that is not true. Every one who is an adult and not a lunatic is fit to manage his house. We may commit mistakes in the begining ; but who is so perfect

as to be beyond human failings? Even great men err. We want the right to commit mistakes also; we will commit mistakes and ourselves rectify them; even the Great Avataras commit mistakes. The Government does not lay down any standard of fitness; if they will lay down any we will try to attain that standard. Governments are not all definite. Those who ask us to be first fit and then demand Swaraj have no mind to give it to us at all. It is as good as to ask a boy to learn swimming and then to go into the river. The Second clause of the resolution in Self—Government, passed at Lucknow, demands this 'Swaraj' at an early date. Our Opponents advise us not to embarass the Government at this time; further more they want us to believe that this is not the time to make the demand. My reply is that this is exactly the time when our demands should be put forth in a definite manner. The colonists are doing the same thing at this time and why should we not do it? The Policy of the Imperial Government is going to be changed, and important changes are to be expected in the constitution and if we will not be awake at this time to guard our interests, who else will do it for us? We ought not to sleep at this time; we must work for attaining our goal.

God is helping us.

It appears, God is helping us, for this time the present circumstances are not the result of our actions or efforts; and so I say the time is favourable to us. When God has come to help us, shall we not exert ourselves? Remember, if we loose this opportunity, we may not get another for a century or so; the colonials have seen

this and they are demanding a voice in the Imperial affairs at this very time. Our demand is comparatively moderate. We simply demand a right to Govern ourselves. In the year 1906, Dadabhai Nowroji proclaimed from the Congress platform this 'swaraj' as our ultimate goal. Till then seperate demands were made in separats departments ; till then we tried to catch the small hairs on the head; but now we say we want to catch the hair tuffs so that we will be re-instated in our position, which is ours by birth ; so we see that our demand is clear and emphatic, made by persons of different opinions after much discussion about it at Lucknow. We have also seen that this is the most proper time to make that demand ; and we must work and work incessantly. You ought not to shirk work for fear of defficulties and dangers and pitfalls. They are bound to come and why shonld they not come ?

BE READY FOR DANGERS.

Our Vedanta says there is little hapiness and much of evil and misery in the world. The world is such, it can not be helped. I foresee dangers in the way and the sighs of these dangers are not wanting ; recently Lord Sydenham, the late Governor of Bombay has asked the Government in the Ninteenth Century, to proclaim once for all that they do not intend to give any more reforms to the Indians ; let the Government declare, he says, "thus far and no further." He expects by this move to shut permanantly the mouths of the Indians. I wonder what he means ! How can a proclamation of this nature shut our mouths ? It is a pity that Lord Sydenham should betray so much ignorance of human

nature ; most of the white skinned papers are raising the same cry ; perhaps this may be an indication of the future policy of the Government.

TWO WAYS OF DEATH.

Whatever that be, one thing is certain, that the work before us is not easy. Fremendous sacrifices will be necessary ; nay, we shall have to die for it ; there are two ways of dying, one consitutional and other unconstitutional. As our fight is going to be constitutional and legal, our death also must as of necessity, be constitutional and legal. We have not to use any violence. nay, we condemn the unconstitutional way of dying. As our fight must be constitutional it must be courageous also. We ought to tell Government courageously and and without the least fear what we want. Let Government know that the whole Nation wants Home Rule, as defined by the Congress. Let there be no shirking, or wavering, or shaking. I said that it was our "right" to have Home Rule but that is a historical and a European way of putting it ; I go further and say that is our "Dharma" : You cannot separate "Home Rule" from us, as you cannot separate the quality of "heat" from fire ; both are inseparably bound up : let your ideas be clear ; let your motives be honest ; let your efforts be strictly constitutional and I am sure your efforts are bound to be crowned with success ; never despair ; be bold and fearless and be sure God is with you. Remember "God helps those who help themselves.'

GRAND DEMONSTRATION

SPEECH OF LOK. TILAK DELIVERED AT HOME RULE LEAGUE OFFICE ALLAHABAD.

7th Oct. 1917.

Babu Motilal Ghose took the chair. Lok. Tilak who was received with shouts of 'Bande Mataram', next addressed the meeting. He said that every one knew what home rule meant. Home rule was the nothing but to have the management of their home in their own hands. That was simplest definition that could be given of the word. There was absolutely nothing to say why they wanted home rule. It was their birthright. Some people had been managing their affairs for them now, and they wanted that that management should be transferred to their hands. They were entitled to that right and the burden of proving that they were not entitled to it lay on the other party. Home rule was not a new expression. It was an expression that had a definite meaning and it could not be misunderstood, though it was to the interest of some people to misunderstand it. All that they asked for was not a change in their rulers but administrators—he distinguished rulers from administrators. The theory inflicted on them was that the rulers of this country were the administrators who had been appointed or selected under the Government of India Act. His view was entirely different. Those were not the rulers in the strict sense of the word. They represented the King but they were not the King. The Indians also represented the King because they were his subjects just as much as those officers. So in the

matter of representing the King the Indians and those officials stood on equal basis. What then was there more in the position of these officers which made them say that they were the real rulers ? That was that certain powers had been given to them—they had not usurped those powers—under a Statute of Parliament. If another Statute of Parliament repealing that statute and giving the Indians those powers was passed the Indians would be what those officers were at present. That was home rule and nothing more. There would be no change in the Emperor, absolutely no change in the relations of India with England or in the relations of India with the Empire as a whole. What was there to complain of in this except that some men would lose their trade ? If the power was transferred from one man to another the man to whom it was transferred would gain and the other would lose and if that other man would be angry it was natural. He did not think that any English politician would be deterred by such things for a moment from doing his duties.

Continuing, Lok. Tilak said that 10 or 15 years ago to talk of home rule was sedition and people were afraid he himself was afraid, of talking about home rule. But now it was conceded both by the judiciary and the executive that home rule was a proper ambition for a dependency to entertain. Ten years of fighting was thus required to remove this prejudice against home rule and now they could talk about it as legitimate aspiration. The Viceroy, the Premier, the British nation and even the bureaucracy now agreed with them. Now what remained ? They said that it was a very good ambition

for a dependency ; but there was time for it. They said that it would take centuries to attain it, and instances were cited of a number of colonies which attained self-government in 50 or 60 years. His reply to it was this. The colonies, it was true, had attained self-government in 50 or 60 years but Indians were being ruled for 100 years, and they had not yet attained self-government. There must be a time limit fixed by the bureaucracy. The bureaucracy said that it was not in sight at present. He would say that this was an entirely selfish argument. What was it that prevented them from attaining the goal within a few years after the war when the empire would be reconstructed ? At present India was nothing but a stone in the neck of the Empire. They knew on what principle the bureaucracy governed India for the last 100 years. They were self-governing nation before. They knew how to organize an army, they knew how to dispense justice, they had laws, regulations, etc. All those had been swept away and now the buureaucracy said that they knew nothing about them. Who was responsible for that ? Not the Indians. When they come here their first care was—he gave credit to them for it—to reduce the disorders prevailing then. How was it done ? Firstly by disarming them. Next all the prinicipal posts in the administration were monopolized by them. Next there was a check to scientific progress, and industries gradually disappeared. But, they said, they restored peace. That was true but peace was not everythiug. It was an introductory condition to further development. They had restored peace, they had given railways, telegraphs and other things. All credit to the

bureaucracy for these things, but he could not give credit to them for doing anything which would develop their national instinct. They had not done anything which would enable them to stand on their legs. The result was when in the name of the Empire they were asked to take up arms and fight the enemy they found that so few men volunteered. What was it that made them incapable of assisting the Empire to the extent that they wished to do ? It was the system of administration followed by the bureaucracy. They had governed them in such a way that unless radical improvement was made in the system of administration the Empire would gain no material strength from this country. It was this thought that had actuated the best English statesmen to come forward and say that the system of administration in India must be revised after the war.

Proceeding, Lok. Tilak said that from the time of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji up to now they had been crying that they had been deprived of the powers of administration and they should be restored to them. Now the British democracy had clearly seen that there was much force in their cry of reform and they were willing to hear their cry. Now the question was whether the bureaucracy should have a say or whether the Indians should have a say. There was a judge and he had given notice that he was coming here and would hear what the Indians would have to say. Therefore they must press their demand more strongly than their opponents. That was their duty at present. They had to convince him that all arguments used against them were due to prejudice. The great work before them at present was to

educate the people to realize what Home Rule was. He would impress on them the supreme necessity of doing their best for getting home rule. They must wake up. If they made strenuous efforts then within a year or two they would realize if not all at least a part of their wishes. They did not want home rule at once; but they wanted a real beginning, and not a shadowy beginning. When Mr. Montagu came here he would speak to their leaders about their demand and he wanted that they should have the solid support of the country behind them. If that was done Mr. Montagu would carry their message to the British people and effectively support it with the authority of his office. (Applause).

ANOTHER GRAND DEMONSTRATION
ADDRESS BY Lok. TILAK.

Appeal For Unity.

Allahabad the 8th Oct. 1917.

Another grand public meeting ot the Indian citizens of Allahabad was held on Monday evening in the compound of the local Home Rule League office at which an address on Home Rule was delivered by Lok. Bal Gangadhar Tilak. The hon. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya was in the chair. As on Sunday the compound of the League's office was fully crowded, the number of persons present being nearly the same as on the previous day. All sections of the Indian community were fully represented, and some had come from the mofussil as well. Several ladies were also present. The whole audience

listened to the address with considerable attention and enthusiasm and gave Mr. Tilak a great ovation at the conclusion of the address.

Lok. Tilak said that one objection raised against Home Rule was that if Home Rule was granted to them they would turn out British people from Innia. Indians did want English people, English institutions, English liberty and the Empire. But what they said was that the internal administration of India should be under Indian coutrol. English people had it in England, they had it in the colonies and they had it everywhere and would claim it everywhere, and if it was not granted to them they would fight for it, and yet some denied to Indians that right. By whom was this bogey of expelling the English from India raised and for what purpose? That must be clearly understood. It was perhaps understood in this country but it was their business to see that the British people understood it in the right way. Those that held power in their hands at present imagined that Indians were not capable of governing themselves to the limited extent implied by the word Home Rule. They did not tell Indians when they would be able to govern themselves. They did not fix any time-limit. Once it used to be said that Asiatic nations were not fit for self-government. That however was not said now. They now said that India was not now fit for self-government. If Indians asked them why, they were told that they had not that thing before, they were deficient in education, there were numerous castes quarrelling among themselves, and only British administrators could hold even balance between rival sections. As regards unfitness he

had said something about it the previous day. But it required to be expanded. What was unfitness ? Did they mean to say that before the British came here there was no peaceful rule anywhere in India ? What was Akbar ? Was he a bad ruler ? No Englishman could say that. Let them go back to Hindu rule. There were the empires of Asoka, Guptas, Rajputs, etc. No history could say that all these empires had managed their statas without any system of administration. There were empires in India as big as the German empire and the Italian empire and they were governed peacefully. When peace reigned in the country under the Hindu, Buddhist and Mahomedan rule, what ground was there to say that the descendants of those people who had governed those empires were today unfit to exercise that right ? There was no disqualification, intellectual or physical which disabled them from taking part in the Government of any empire. They had shown their fitness in the past and were prepared to show it today if opportunities were granted to them. The charge of unfitness came only from those who held the monopoly of power in their hands. In every case of monopoly that argument was used. The East India Company used that argument. None of them present there whose ancestors had founded and administered empires would subscribe to the doctrine that Indians, whether Hindus or Moslems were incapable of governing themselves. The charge of incapacity was only brought forward by interested people, simply because their self-interest demanded that some argument must be advanced in their support. They were not given higher posts to show their capacity. They were only

given subordinate posts. Without the aid of Indians in the subordinate departments it was impossible for the British people to carry on the administration; and so they were given all the subordinate posts. They had been fighting ever since the establishment of the Congress to break this monopoly and not without success. A few posts reserved for the civil service had been granted to them. A few appointments in the judicial department—High Court judgeships, etc.,—had been granted to them. What was the result? He had not seen any resolution of the Government saying that when any post of responsibility was given to Indians they had misused those opportunities, that they had failed to come up to the standard of efficiency required. On the contrary resolutions had been issued saying that Indians who had acted as members of executive councils had done their duty very well. If they went to the Indian states they would find that all higher posts were held by Indians. What did the British administration reports say about these states? They said that they were well administered. So the whole evidence that was possible for them to produce was in their favour. After barring them from these higher services and saying that they were not capable of governing was adding insult to injury. This kind of jugglery would not do. The British democracy would not tolerate it. If they simply pressed the right view on the British public, they would hear it now because they were in a mood to hear it. They had logic and experience on their side, but mere logic and truth would not succeed in this world unless backed up by persistent agitation and fixed determination to attain

that truth. They must be determined to see that truth triumphed and that triumph was what they meant to achieve. The Home Rule propaganda was intended for that purpose.

Proceeding. Lok. Tilak said that another argument used against Home Rule was that there were certain British interests which would be endangered if Home Rule was given. Mr. Jinnah had told them the previous day that there were British interests not only in India but all over the world. Those British interests had been created, to speak in legal terminology, without their (Indian) consent. They had never been asked when those interests were created. Legally speaking they were not barred from agitating, They knew that those British interests would be safeguarded as far as justice and law were concerned. The law of the land would remain the same. The offices would remain the same. There would no doubt be a change, but that change would be so far as control was concerned, They wanted law. They could not do without law. To say that if Home Rule was granted to Indians there would be chaos was simple nonsense. They wanted law, they wanted all the departments, even the C. I. D. They wanted as much good rule as at present. They did not want to lapse into misrule. All that they wanted was to have those laws and rule and all those depratments which administered those laws under their control. Only the previous day he read in the *Pioneer* the instance of Arrah riots and in mentioning the steps that had been taken to suppress that riot it appealed to Government to look to its duty namely, that of governing people. Did they mean to say that they were going to tolerate riots

under Home Rule ; Certainly not. They wanted peace. They would frame such rules by which riots might be averted with the consent of the people, and not without their consent. As regards the question of employment, if the Europeans were prepared to serve they would employ them, if they were fit and if they would accept what they were paid. They did not want anybody to leave India. He knew that British capital was invested in railways, but they did not want to uproot the rails and send them away to England. They wanted the railway and he thought that railways could be better administered if more Indians were employed on them. There would be changes under Home Rule, but not changes for the worse, they would lead to more efficient and economical rule. Their demand was at once sober and constitutional. It remained to be seen whether the British democracy would grant those demands or not. Continuing. Lok. Tilak said that what was at present repuired was a good statement of their case so that the British people who now felt inclined to make a change in the constitution of the Empire might perceive the case more fully than they had hitherto done. It was the interest of some people to have the case misrepresented, to create misunderstanding and create darkness. That ought not to be allowed to be done. In this connection he must say that Home Rule leagues had done more work than the Congress committees. It had been said that there was the Congress and they were opposing the Congress by supporting the Home Rule League. His anawer was no. The ideal and demand of the Home Rule League were the same as the ideal and demand of the

Congress. It had been expressly stated from the Home Rule League platform. They did not go beyond the Congress demand. He might say the Home Rnle League had been instrumental in bringing about that resolution passed by the Congress last year. So. there were no differences of ideas between the League and the Congress Then, it was asked, where was the necessity for the Home Rule League ? The work done by the Home Rule leagues spoke for itself. These Leagues had been started to educate the people and make them understand what their goal should be. If this work had been done by the Congress he should at once have given up his membership of the Home Rule League. Some people wanted to work more vigorously than others. He thought every one was entitled to do that. They might form small leagues under any name. The object was the same. He wanted every one of them to work in their own way either by leagues or by associations or individually under as many different names as they liked. Names did not matter so long as the idea was the same. The work must be done provincially and in the vernaculars of the province. The work of educating the people could only be carried on in this way. There wss a time when the word Home Rule was looked upon with suspicion as suggesting Irish methods, and the Irish disturbances connected with the same. They could not find a thing which had no previous associations. They must not attach particular importance to particular words. The words were made for them and not they for the words. If they used the word Home Rule what was the objection to it provided they said in the beginning what

they meant by it ? That controversy was therefore out of place. The real dispute now was not about words. It was about educating the people and he knew that as they began to educate the people, the discontent among the official class would increase, because they would see that eventually the demand would be forced on them. They should not care for that discontent. There was a time when it was held that they should work in such a way as to enlist the sympatby of the administrators in the land. Of course they did wish to enlist their sympathy. but if that sympathy could not be enlisted without lowering the tone of the educative work and without lessening their effort; he was not prepared to secure that sympathy. They were all agreed that they must have Home Rule for their goal. They must strive for it. The question was how to strive for it. Some wanted to proceed slowly, while others wanted to proceed fast. He did not think that this was a difference for which they should quarrel and give an opportunity to their opponents to use these differences against them. They should not talk of method. Every one might have his one method provided it was constitutional. He wanted each man to keep himself within the bounds of law and constitution. He made a distinction between law and constitution. So long as law-making was not in their hands laws which were repugnant to justice and morality would be sometimes passed. They could not obey them. Passive resistance was the means to an end but was not the goal in itself. Passive resistance meant that they had to balance the advantages and nisadvantages arising from obeying a particular order

and not obeying it. If in their balanced judgment they found that the advantages of disobeying it under particular circumstances were greater, the sense of morality justify them in acting upon that conviction. This was a very complicated question, and not a question which could be discussed by a large gathering like that. They must leave the question to their leaders for their decision. They must clearly understand what passive resistance meant. It was a determination to achieve their goal at any sacrifices. If they wanted to reach their goal and if they were hindered by artificial and unjust legislation and by any unjust combination of circumstances it was their duty to fight it out. The Home Rule League wanted them to know this. If they did not want to use the words 'passive resistance' they might use the words 'at all sacrifices' but he would use both words in the sense in which he explained them. He did not preach unruliness or illegality, but he preached fixed determination to reach the goal at any sacrifice. Passive resistance, he said, was perfectly constitutional. Law and constitution were not the same. That was proved by history. So long as a particular law was not in conformity with justice and morality, and popular opinion according to the ethics of the 19th and 20th centuries, so long as a particular order was not consistent with all these principles it might be leagl, but it was not constitutional. That was a distinction which he wished them to observe very clearly. They should not confound the words 'constitutionally' and 'legally.' He wanted them therefore to confine themselves to strictly constitutional means and he wanted to tell them at the same time that every

law in the technical sense of the term was not constitutional. They should educate their people and see that the right political ideal was placed before them, and their sense of justice roused so that they might work hard for that ideal without flinching in any way from it, and with all the detrmination they could command.

In conclusion Lok. Tilak asked the people to join the Home Rule League in large numbers and do the work of educating the people. They must wake up, and do the work enthusiastically. If they would not do it it would be great misfortune to the country. They would not only be ruining themselves but they would be ruining the future generation also. If they did not work for it now the future generations would curse them. They would have to do their duty to the country, to the future generations and above all to God. It was a duty which they owed to Providence which governed all nations. That Providence was favourably disposed towards them; and they should not let go the opportunity granted to them by Providence. He would impress on them the necessity of moving unitedly at present, irrespective of caste or creed, or jealousies fearlessly and boldly. If they did that he was confident that their efforts would be crowned with success in the course of a few years by the blessing of Providence. (LOUD APPLAUSE.)

LOK. TILAK AT AGRA.

LECTUR ON HOME RULE.

Agra, 30 Nov. 17.

Lok. Tilak delivered a public lecture this morning. Master Shanker Dayal was in the cheir. After some poems in Urdu and Hindi were read Lok. Tilak was called upon to speak and he thanked the audience for allowing him an opportunity to express before them what was passing in his mind and said that he would devote the time allowed him to a review of India's past political history and to indicate what should be done at the present time. He said that the word Swarajya was first used by the revered leader Dadabhai Naoroji. At that time it was considered sedition to ask for Swarajya, but the Calcutta High Court decided that it was lawful to preach Swarajya. Several stages followed this and now it was not only permissable to preach and to ask for Home Rule, but even the Government had declared that the aim of their policy in India was to grant responsible self-government to the people. To achieve this result many sufferings would have to be borne by Indians and much sacrifice would have to be made. The Anglo-Indians were hostile to our aspirations and they had submitted a scheme which was most reactionary and calculated to deceive Indians. He said that Indians did not desire illusory concessions. They aimed at reforms in the central government which would as a matter of course remove the evils in provincial Government. There were to things upon which particular emphasis should be laid by Indians. First, there was the enlarge-

ment of the Imperial Legislative Council with a majo
of elected members as proposed by the Congress-Lea
scheme and the second thing was the subordinatio
the executive to the legislature. He made it clea
the audience that unless the masses supported the a
tation led by the intellectuals, the hope of success
meagre. It was necessary that a deputation should
sent to England and the public there should be instru
ed regarding Indian conditions and Indians here sho
back up the demands of the deputation by a vigor
agitation. He exhorted the audience to make sacrifi
and to work unflinchingly for the attainment of Ho
Rule.
